arXiv:1609.05768v1 [math.PR] 19 Sep 2016

Time-dependent rate of convergence for binomial approximations

Antti Luoto[1]

Abstract

Let W be a Brownian motion. Then $u(t,x) = \mathbb{E}[g(x+\sigma W_{T-t})]$ is the solution of the backward heat equation with terminal condition g. Let $v^n(t,x)$ denote the according approximation produced by a simple random walk. This paper is concerned with the rate of convergence of $v^n(t,x)$ to $u(t,x)$ for functions g of bounded variation and Lipschitz functions, and the behavior of the error $v^n(t,x) - u(t,x)$ as t tends to T.

Keywords: simple random walk approximation, weak rate of convergence, first exit time of Brownian bridge, functions of bounded variation

Contents

1 Introduction **2**

2 The setting and the decomposition of the error **3**
2.1 Construction of the random walk 3
2.2 The result 5

3 The adjustment error **6**

4 The local error **8**
4.1 Notation and definitions 8
4.2 The local error for functions of bounded variation 9
4.2.1 Functions of bounded variation 9
4.2.2 Estimation of the error for functions of bounded variation 10
4.3 The local error for Lipschitz functions 16

5 The global error **17**
5.1 Estimates related to the random walk 18
5.2 Estimation of the global error 19

[1]Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Jyväskylä, Finland.
antti.k.luoto@student.jyu.com

6 Moment estimates for the stopping time J_n **26**
6.1 Tail behavior of τ_{n_θ} and $J_n - n_\theta$ 27
6.2 Higher moment estimates for the difference $J_n - n_\theta$ 29
6.3 Estimates for the first and the second moment of J_n 32

7 Appendix: Results related to random times L and J **40**

1 Introduction

The approximation of the Brownian motion by a simple random walk, justified by Donsker's theorem, is used for theoretical considerations as well as to compute numerically expressions depending on the Brownian motion. For example, in option pricing, the Black–Scholes model is replaced by the Cox–Ross–Rubinstein model. For European options (with pay-off functions which are exponentially bounded and piecewise C^2) a detailed error analysis has been provided by John B. Walsh in [11]. The central idea there is to represent the random walk via Skorokhod embedding on the same probability space where the Brownian motion is defined. This method has been used first by D. Lamberton and C. Rogers for American options in [6]. In [4] it was shown that this also works for path-dependent options. In [7] it is sketched how one can get error estimates for the 'Greeks' of European options using the error analysis of [11] in connection with discretized Malliavin calculus and Malliavin weights.

The common requirement in the above results concerning the pay-off function is Lipschitz continuity (or piecewise C^2 in [11]).

The aim of this paper is to weaken this regularity condition to the class of functions of bounded variation, and to investigate the blow-up of the error in dependence of time. Estimates which take the time dependence into consideration would be needed to get convergence rates for discretization schemes for backward stochastic differential equations. Such schemes were considered, for instance, in [2]. More in detail, we are concerned with the following question. Let $(W_t)_{t\geq 0}$ be a Brownian motion and $(\xi_k)_{k=1}^\infty$ a Rademacher sequence, i.e. a sequence of independent random variables such that $\mathbb{P}(\xi_k = \pm 1) = \frac{1}{2}$. Choose a time horizon T, let $\sigma > 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and let $h = \sigma\sqrt{T/n}$. For the class of functions g on $\mathbb{R}$ of bounded variation we are interested in the weak rate of convergence of the error

$$\varepsilon_{n,t,x}(g) := \mathbb{E}\big[g\big(x + \sigma W^{(n)}_{T-t}\big)\big] - \mathbb{E}\big[g\big(x + \sigma W_{T-t}\big)\big] \tag{1.1}$$

in terms of h, and how it changes with $t \in [0, T)$. Here

$$W^{(n)}_{T-t} := \sqrt{\tfrac{T}{n}} \sum_{k=1}^{2\lceil \frac{T-t}{2T/n}\rceil} \xi_k. \tag{1.2}$$

Notice that the function u given by

$$u(t,x) := \mathbb{E}[g(\sigma W_T)|\sigma W_t = x] = \mathbb{E}[g(x + \sigma W_{T-t})], \quad (t,x) \in [0,T) \times \mathbb{R},$$

is the solution of the backward heat equation with terminal condition g,

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial}{\partial t}u + \frac{\sigma^2}{2}\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2}u = 0, & (t,x) \in [0,T) \times \mathbb{R} \\ u(T,x) = g(x), & x \in \mathbb{R}. \end{cases}$$

Hence

$$v^n(t,x) := \mathbb{E}\big[g\big(x + \sigma W^{(n)}_{T-t}\big)\big]$$

represents an approximation of $u(t,x)$.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we introduce the notation and recall the construction of a simple random walk via Skorokhod embedding, i.e. one uses the paths of a Brownian motion. This construction then naturally causes a splitting of the error into three parts. The estimates for these three parts are the main result of this paper. They are given in Theorem 2.2 and Corollary 2.4.

The first part of the error is implied by that fact that the approximation $v^n(t,x)$ is constant in t on intervals of length $2T/n$, while $u(t,x)$ changes continuously. We will call this the *adjustment error*. The second and the third part of the error appear because the construction of the simple random walk uses the Brownian motion at a stopping time which can be larger of smaller than $T-t$, while for $u(t,x)$ we use W_{T-t}. The second part of the error is influenced by the smoothness properties of g and carries the name *local error*. For the last part, the *global error*, integrability properties of g are needed.

In Section 3 an estimate for the adjustment error is computed. Section 4 takes care of the local error and follows in many places the ideas and the machinery of J.B. Walsh [11]. What is new is that we take the time dependence into consideration, i.e. we are interested in the blow-up of the error (1.1) as $t \to T$. Moreover, we consider different classes of functions (Lipschitz functions and functions of bounded variations). As a consequence, we can not have a detailed error analysis as in [11] but rather an estimate. In Section 5 the global error is treated. For possible further extensions of the results to other classes of functions we allow there exponentially bounded, measurable functions.

Section 6 contains a collection of used moment estimates and tail behaviors of random times appearing in the description of the splitting of the error into a global and a local one. Again, it was possible to adjust methods from [11] to our setting; only Subsection 6.2 is done differently. In the appendix some more facts about the distribution of the used random times are listed, and their connection to a Brownian bridge is explained.

2 The setting and the decomposition of the error

For technical reasons, we will split the error (1.1) into three parts. The next subsection provides the necessary notation for this.

2.1 Construction of the random walk

Consider the standard Brownian motion $(W_t)_{t\geq 0}$ on a stochastic basis $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\geq 0})$, where $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\geq 0}$ stands for the natural filtration of $(W_t)_{t\geq 0}$. We also let

$$(X_t)_{t\geq 0} := (\sigma W_t)_{t\geq 0},$$

where $\sigma > 0$ is a given constant. By $\tau^{(h)}$ we denote the first exit time of the Brownian motion $(X_t)_{t\geq 0}$ from the open interval $(-h, h)$;

$$\tau^{(h)} := \inf\{t \geq 0 : |X_t - X_0| = h\} = \inf\{t \geq 0 : |W_t - W_0| = h/\sigma\}, \quad h > 0. \tag{2.1}$$

The random variable $\tau^{(h)}$ is a $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\geq 0}$-stopping time, and its (extended) Laplace transform of $\tau^{(h)}$ is given by

$$\lambda \mapsto \mathbb{E}\left[e^{\lambda\tau^{(h)}}\right] = \begin{cases} \left[\cosh(\frac{h}{\sigma}\sqrt{2|\lambda|})\right]^{-1}, & \lambda \leq 0, \\ \left[\cos(\frac{h}{\sigma}\sqrt{2\lambda})\right]^{-1}, & 0 < \lambda < \frac{\pi^2}{8}\frac{\sigma^2}{h^2} \end{cases}. \tag{2.2}$$

By differentiating with respect to λ, one verifies that $\tau^{(h)}$ has finite moments of all orders. More precisely, for every $K \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a constant $C_K > 0$ (depending at most on K) such that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[(\tau^{(h)})^K\right] = C_K\,(h/\sigma)^{2K}. \tag{2.3}$$

In particular, $C_1 = 1$ and $C_2 = 5/3$. For relations (2.2) and (2.3), see [11, Proposition 11.1].

In order to represent the error (1.1), we construct a random walk on the probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\geq 0})$ described above. Following [6] and [11], we define

$$\tau_0 := 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \tau_k := \inf\left\{t \geq \tau_{k-1} : \left|X_t - X_{\tau_{k-1}}\right| = h\right\}, \tag{2.4}$$

recursively for all $k = 1, 2, \ldots$. Then τ_k is $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. finite $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\geq 0}$-stopping time for all $k \geq 0$, and the process $(X_{\tau_k})_{k=0,1,\ldots}$ is a symmetric simple random walk on $\mathbb{Z}^h := \{mh : m \in \mathbb{Z}\}$.

Remark 2.1. For every integer $k \geq 1$ we let

$$\Delta\tau_k := \tau_k - \tau_{k-1}, \qquad \Delta X_{\tau_k} := X_{\tau_k} - X_{\tau_{k-1}}. \tag{2.5}$$

The strong Markov property of $(X_t)_{t\geq 0}$ implies that $(\Delta\tau_k, \Delta X_{\tau_k})_{k=1,2,\ldots}$ is an i.i.d. process, such that for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$(\Delta\tau_k, \Delta X_{\tau_k}) \overset{d}{=} (\tau^{(h)}, X_{\tau^{(h)}}) \quad \text{and} \quad (\Delta\tau_k, \Delta X_{\tau_k}) \text{ is independent of } \mathcal{F}_{\tau_{k-1}+},$$

and where $\mathbb{P}(\Delta X_{\tau_k} = \pm h) = \mathbb{P}(X_{\tau^{(h)}} = \pm h) = 1/2$. Moreover, as shown in [9, Proposition 1], the increments ΔX_{τ_1} and $\Delta\tau_1$ are independent. As a result of the above, the processes $(\Delta_{\tau_k})_{k=1,2,\ldots}$ and $(\Delta X_{\tau_k})_{k=1,2,\ldots}$ are independent (see also [11, Proposition 11.1], [6, Proposition 2.4]).

From item (ii) of Remark 2.1 we deduce that

$$X_{\tau_N} = \sum_{k=1}^{N} \Delta X_{\tau_k} \overset{d}{=} h\sum_{k=1}^{N} \xi_k,$$

where $(\xi_k)_{k=1,2,\ldots}$ is an i.i.d. Rademacher sequence. Therefore, for $W^{(n)}_{T-t_0}$ defined in (1.2), it holds that

$$X_{\tau_N} \overset{d}{=} \sigma W^{(n)}_{T-t_0}, \quad \text{if } (h, N) = \left(\sigma\sqrt{T/n}, 2\lceil\tfrac{T-t_0}{2T/n}\rceil\right).$$

Notice that the sequence of stopping times $(\tau_k)_{k=0,1,\dots}$ now depends on n via h.

The error (1.1) will be split into three parts, where each of these parts will take into account different properties of the given function g. For this purpose, let us introduce some notation. For given $n \in 2\mathbb{N}$[1] and $t_0 \in [0,T)$, we let $\theta_0 := T - t_0 \in (0,T]$ and

$$\theta_n := \tfrac{n_\theta T}{n}, \quad \text{where} \quad n_\theta := 2\left\lceil \tfrac{\theta_0}{2T/n} \right\rceil \in \{2,4,\dots n\}. \tag{2.6}$$

By definition, θ_n is the smallest even multiple of $\frac{T}{n}$ greater than or equal to $\theta_0 = T - t_0$, where the according even integer is given by n_θ. Obviously,

$$0 \le \theta_n - \theta_0 \le \tfrac{2T}{n} \quad \text{and} \quad \theta_n \xrightarrow{n\to\infty} \theta_0 = T - t_0.$$

Moreover, if we let $t_k^n := \frac{2kT}{n}$ for each $k \in \{0,1,\dots,n/2\}$, then

$$t_0 \in [t_k^n, t_{k+1}^n) \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \theta_n = T - t_k^n.$$

2.2 The result

Following [11], we define an auxiliary random variable J_n on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\ge 0})$ by letting

$$J_n(\omega) := \inf\{2m \in 2\mathbb{N} : \tau_{2m}(\omega) > \theta_n\}, \tag{2.7}$$

where the step size related to $(\tau_k)_{k=0,1,\dots}$ is $h = \sigma\sqrt{T/n}$ and notice that J_n is a $(\mathcal{F}_{\tau_k^n})_{k=0,1,\dots}$-stopping time. Moreover, τ_{J_n} is a $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\ge 0}$-stopping time, and both J_n and τ_{J_n} are $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. finite. The error $\varepsilon_{n,t_0,x_0}(g)$ given by (1.1) is then decomposed as follows:

$$\varepsilon_{n,t_0,x_0}(g) = \varepsilon^{\text{glob}}_{n,t_0,x_0}(g) + \varepsilon^{\text{loc}}_{n,t_0,x_0}(g) + \varepsilon^{\text{adj}}_{n,t_0,x_0}(g), \quad \text{where}$$

$$\varepsilon^{\text{glob}}_{n,t_0,x_0}(g) := \mathbb{E}[g(x_0+X_{\tau_{n_\theta}}) - g(x_0+X_{\tau_{J_n}})], \quad \text{("the global error")} \tag{2.8}$$

$$\varepsilon^{\text{loc}}_{n,t_0,x_0}(g) := \mathbb{E}[g(x_0+X_{\tau_{J_n}}) - g(x_0+X_{\theta_n})], \quad \text{("the local error")} \tag{2.9}$$

$$\varepsilon^{\text{adj}}_{n,t_0,x_0}(g) := \mathbb{E}\left[g(x_0+X_{\theta_n}) - g(x_0+X_{T-t_0})\right], \quad \text{("the adjustment error")}. \tag{2.10}$$

Theorem 2.2. *Let $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, $t_0 \in [0,T)$ and $n \in 2\mathbb{N}$.*

(A) If $g \in BV$ and $t_0 \in [t_k^n, t_{k+1}^n)$, we have

$$\left|\varepsilon^{adj}_{n,t_0,x_0}(g)\right| \le \frac{C^{adj}_{BV}}{n(T-t_0)}, \quad \left|\varepsilon^{loc}_{n,t_0,x_0}(g)\right| \le \frac{C^{loc}_{BV}}{\sqrt{n(T-t_k^n)}} \quad \text{and} \quad \left|\varepsilon^{glob}_{n,t_0,x_0}(g)\right| \le \frac{C^{glob}}{n(T-t_k^n)}.$$

(B) If $g \in Lip$ and $t_0 \in [t_k^n, t_{k+1}^n)$, then

$$\left|\varepsilon^{adj}_{n,t_0,x_0}(g)\right| \le \frac{C^{adj}_{Lip}}{n(T-t_0)}, \quad \left|\varepsilon^{loc}_{n,t_0,x_0}(g)\right| \le \frac{C^{loc}_{Lip}}{\sqrt{n}} \quad \text{and} \quad \left|\varepsilon^{glob}_{n,t_0,x_0}(g)\right| \le \frac{C^{glob}}{n(T-t_k^n)}.$$

[1] In order to avoid the fluctuation caused by the changing parity of the values of a symmetric random walk, we will restrict our consideration to even integers n.

The constants for the adjustment error and the local error above are given by

$$C_{BV}^{adj} = 2\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}}|g(x)|\,T, \quad C_{BV}^{loc} = \frac{3}{2}\sqrt{T}\Big(V_{g(\cdot-)} + \sum_{x\in\mathbb{R}:\Delta g(x)\neq 0}|\Delta g(x)|\Big)$$
$$C_{Lip}^{adj} = \frac{5}{2}K_g\sigma T^{3/2}, \quad C_{Lip}^{loc} = 5K_g\sigma\sqrt{T}.$$

Moreover, $C^{glob} > 0$ depends at most on σ, T, x_0 and g.

Remark 2.3. (i): In the statement of Theorem 2.2, $V_{g(\cdot-)}$ is the total variation of the left-continuous function $x \mapsto g(x-) := \lim_{\tilde{x}\to x-} g(\tilde{x})$, $\Delta g(x) = g(x) - g(x-)$, and $K_g > 0$ is the Lipschitz constant of g.

(ii): While there is no explicit representation for the constant C^{glob}, the error $\left|\varepsilon^{\text{glob}}_{n,t_0,x_0}(g)\right|$ has the following structure: if $g \in BV$ or $g \in Lip$ and $t_0 \in [t_k^n, t_{k+1}^n)$, then

$$\left|\varepsilon^{\text{glob}}_{n,t_0,x_0}(g)\right| \le \frac{\tilde{C}^{\text{glob}}_{n,t_0,x_0}(g)}{n(T-t_k^n)} + \frac{C(\sigma,T,x_0,g)}{(n(T-t_k^n))^{3/2}}, \qquad \text{where}$$
$$\tilde{C}^{\text{glob}}_{n,t_0,x_0}(g) := \frac{5T}{12}\left|\mathbb{E}\left[g(x_0+\sigma W^{(n)}_{T-t_0})\right]\right| + \frac{T}{6}\left|\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{\sigma W^{(n)}_{T-t_0}}{\sqrt{\sigma^2(T-t_k^n)}}\right)^2 g(x_0+\sigma W^{(n)}_{T-t_0})\right]\right|$$
$$+ \frac{T}{12}\left|\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{\sigma W^{(n)}_{T-t_0}}{\sqrt{\sigma^2(T-t_k^n)}}\right)^4 g(x_0+\sigma W^{(n)}_{T-t_0})\right]\right|.$$

Corollary 2.4. *Suppose that $g \in BV \cup Lip$, $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $n \in 2\mathbb{N}$. Moreover, suppose that $t_0 \in [0,T)$. Then there exists a constant $C = C(\sigma,T,x_0,g) > 0$ such that*

$$|\varepsilon_{n,t_0,x_0}(g)| \le \frac{C}{\sqrt{n}(T-t_0)}.$$

However, if $t_0 \in [0,T)$ is a discretization point, i.e. $t_0 = t_k^n$, then there exists a constant $\tilde{C} = \tilde{C}(\sigma,T,x_0,g) > 0$ such that

$$|\varepsilon_{n,t_0,x_0}(g)| \le \frac{\tilde{C}}{\sqrt{n(T-t_k^n)}}.$$

3 The adjustment error

In this section, we first derive an upper bound for the adjustment error introduced in (2.10) for exponentially bounded Borel functions. More explicit bounds are then computed in the cases of bounded variation and Lipschitz continuity.

Definition 3.1 (Exponentially bounded function)**.** A function $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is said to be exponentially bounded, if there exist constants $A, b > 0$ such that

$$|f(x)| \le Ae^{b|x|} \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{3.1}$$

The class of all Borel functions with the property (3.1) will be denoted by $\mathcal{B}_{\text{exp}}$.

Proposition 3.2. *Suppose that $f \in \mathcal{B}_{exp}$ and $n \in 2\mathbb{N}$. If $t_0 \in [t_k^n, t_{k+1}^n)$, then*

$$\left|\varepsilon_{n,t_0,0}^{adj}(f)\right| = \left|\mathbb{E}\left[f(X_{T-t_k^n}) - f(X_{T-t_0})\right]\right| \leq \sup_{\xi\in(T-t_0,T-t_k^n)} \frac{C_\xi^{adj}(f)}{T-t_0}\frac{T}{n}, \tag{3.2}$$

$$\text{where} \quad C_\xi^{adj}(f) := \left|\mathbb{E}\left[f(X_\xi)\right] - \mathbb{E}\left[f(X_\xi)\left(\frac{X_\xi}{\sigma\sqrt{\xi}}\right)^2\right]\right|. \tag{3.3}$$

Proof of Proposition 3.2. Denote by p_t the density of X_t for each $t \geq 0$, and let

$$u(r) := u(r,0) = \mathbb{E}[f(X_{T-r})] = \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(y)p_{T-r}(y)dy, \quad 0 < r < T.$$

Since $f \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{exp}}$, we can use differentiation under the integral sign to show that

$$u'(r) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(y)\tfrac{\partial}{\partial r}p_{T-r}(y)dy = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{f(y)p_{T-r}(y)}{2(T-r)}\left(1 - \frac{y^2}{\sigma^2(T-r)}\right)dy.$$

Therefore, for $0 \leq s < t < T$, the mean value theorem implies that for some constant $\eta \in (s,t)$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
|u(t) - u(s)| &= \left|\int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{f(y)p_{T-\eta}(y)}{2(T-\eta)}\Big(1 - \frac{y^2}{\sigma^2(T-\eta)}\Big)(t-s)dy\right| \\
&\leq \frac{t-s}{2(T-t)} \sup_{\eta\in(s,t)}\left|\int_{\mathbb{R}} f(y)p_{T-\eta}(y)\Big(1 - \frac{y^2}{\sigma^2(T-\eta)}\Big)dy\right| \\
&= \frac{t-s}{2(T-t)} \sup_{\xi\in(T-t,T-s)} C_\xi^{\text{adj}}(f),
\end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

where $C_\xi^{\text{adj}}(f)$ is given by (3.3). Fix $n \in 2\mathbb{N}$ and choose $(s,t) = (t_k^n, t_0)$; then by (3.4),

$$\left|\varepsilon_{n,t_0,0}(f)^{\text{adj}}\right| = |u(t) - u(s)| \leq \frac{t_0 - t_k^n}{2(T-t_0)} \sup_\xi C_\xi^{\text{adj}}(f) \leq \sup_\xi \frac{C_\xi^{\text{adj}}(f)}{T-t_0}\frac{T}{n},$$

where the supremum is taken over the interval $(T-t_0, T-t_k^n)$. □

For the definition of the classes BV and Lip, see Definitions 4.3 and 4.14.

Corollary 3.3. *Let $(t_0,x_0) \in [0,T)\times\mathbb{R}$ and $n \in 2\mathbb{N}$. The following implications hold:*

$$(i): \quad g \in BV \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \left|\varepsilon_{n,t_0,x_0}^{adj}(g)\right| \leq \frac{C_{BV}}{n(T-t_0)},$$

$$(ii): \quad g \in Lip \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \left|\varepsilon_{n,t_0,x_0}^{adj}(g)\right| \leq \frac{C_{Lip}}{n(T-t_0)},$$

where $C_{BV} := 2\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}}|g(x)|\,T$, $C_{Lip} := \frac{5}{2}K\sigma T^{3/2}$ and where $K > 0$ is the Lipschitz constant.

Proof. (i): If $g \in BV$, both g and the function $f(x) := g(x_0 + x)$ are bounded. Hence we can upper bound the coefficient $C_\xi^{\text{adj}}(f)$ in (3.3) by

$$C_\xi^{\text{adj}}(f) \le \mathbb{E}\left|f(\sigma\sqrt{\xi}W_1)\right| + \mathbb{E}\left|f(\sigma\sqrt{\xi}W_1)W_1^2\right| \le 2\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}}|g(x)|, \quad \xi \in (0,T].$$

But since $\varepsilon_{n,t_0,x_0}^{\text{adj}}(g) = \varepsilon_{n,t_0,0}^{\text{adj}}(f)$, the claim follows by Proposition 3.2.

(ii): If $g \in Lip$, then also $f(x) := g(x_0 + x) \in Lip$, and both of these functions share the Lipschitz constant, say $K > 0$. Denote by γ the density of standard normal distribution. Then, if $C_\xi^{\text{adj}}(f)$ is given by (3.3), for each $0 < \xi < T$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
C_\xi(f)^{\text{adj}} &\le |\mathbb{E}[f(X_\xi)] - f(0)| + \left|\mathbb{E}\left[f(X_\xi)\left(\tfrac{X_\xi}{\sigma\sqrt{\xi}}\right)^2\right] - f(0)\right| \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left|f\left(x\sigma\sqrt{\xi}\right) - f(0)\right| \gamma(x)dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left|f\left(x\sigma\sqrt{\xi}\right) - f(0)\right| x^2\gamma(x)dx \\
&\le K\sigma\sqrt{\xi}\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} |x|\,\gamma(x)dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}} |x|^3\,\gamma(x)dx\right) \\
&\le K\sigma\sqrt{T}\left(\mathbb{E}\,|W_1| + \mathbb{E}\,|W_1|^3\right)
\end{aligned}$$

But since $\mathbb{E}\,|W_1| + \mathbb{E}\,|W_1|^3 = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} + 2\sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \le \frac{5}{2}$ and $\varepsilon_{n,t_0,x_0}^{\text{adj}}(g) = \varepsilon_{n,t_0,0}^{\text{adj}}(f)$, the claim follows by Proposition 3.2. □

4 The local error

4.1 Notation and definitions

Suppose that $(h,\theta) \in (0,\infty) \times (0,T]$. The objective of this section is to first derive an upper bound for the modulus of

$$\varepsilon_{h,\theta}^{\text{loc}}(f) := \mathbb{E}[f(X_{\tau_J}) - f(X_\theta)], \tag{4.1}$$

as a function of (h,θ), where

$$J = J(h,\theta) = \inf\{2m : \tau_{2m} > \theta\}, \tag{4.2}$$

and where the function f is either a function of bounded variation or Lipschitz. Afterwards, in Corollaries 4.16 and 4.13, upper bounds for this error are derived in the dynamic setting, where the step size h and the level θ are allowed to depend on n. Observe that when $(h,\theta) = (\sigma\sqrt{T/n}, 2\lceil\frac{T-t_0}{2T/n}\rceil)$, J agrees with J_n defined in (2.7).

Let us start by introducing the following notation:

$$\mathbb{Z}_o^h := \{(2k+1)h : k \in \mathbb{Z}\}, \quad \mathbb{Z}_e^h := \{2kh : k \in \mathbb{Z}\} \tag{4.3}$$

(o refers to 'odd' and e refers to 'even'); then $\mathbb{Z}^h = \mathbb{Z}_o^h \cup \mathbb{Z}_e^h$. In addition, we will abbreviate

$$d_o(x) := \text{dist}(x, \mathbb{Z}_o^h), \quad d_e(x) := \text{dist}(x, \mathbb{Z}_e^h) = h - d_o(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{4.4}$$

Following the ideas of [11], we will introduce linear operators which will serve to compute the conditional expectation $\mathbb{E}[f(X_{\tau_J})|\mathcal{F}_\theta]$.

Definition 4.1. Define operators Π_o and Π_e acting on functions $u : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\Pi_e u(x) := u(x) \text{ if } x \in \mathbb{Z}_e^h \quad \text{and} \quad x \mapsto \Pi_e u(x) \text{ linear in } [2kh, (2k+2)h] \; \forall k \in \mathbb{Z},$$

$$\Pi_o u(x) := u(x) \text{ if } x \in \mathbb{Z}_o^h \quad \text{and} \quad x \mapsto \Pi_o u(x) \text{ linear in } [(2k-1)h, (2k+1)h] \; \forall k \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

The key ingredient in the estimation of $\varepsilon_{h,\theta}^{\text{loc}}(f)$ is Proposition 7.6, which states that if f is a Borel function satisfying the integrability condition $\mathbb{E}|f(X_{\tau_J})| < \infty$, then

$$\mathbb{E}[f(X_{\tau_J})|\mathcal{F}_\theta] = \Pi_e f(X_\theta) 1_{\{L \text{ odd}\}} + \Pi_o \Pi_e f(X_\theta) 1_{\{L \text{ even}\}}, \tag{4.5}$$

$$\text{where} \quad L := L(\theta, h) := \sup\{m \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\} : \tau_m < \theta\}. \tag{4.6}$$

As an immediate consequence of (4.5), we have the result below. Recall Definition 3.1 for the class $\mathcal{B}_{\text{exp}}$.

Corollary 4.2. *For $f \in \mathcal{B}_{exp}$, it holds that*

$$\varepsilon_{h,\theta}^{loc}(f) = \mathbb{E}\big[\Pi_e f(X_\theta) - f(X_\theta)\big] + \mathbb{E}\big[\big(\Pi_o \Pi_e f(X_\theta) - \Pi_e f(X_\theta)\big)\mathbb{P}(L \textit{ even}|X_\theta)\big]. \tag{4.7}$$

Proof. If $f \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{exp}}$, then also $\Pi_e f \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{exp}}$ and $\Pi_o \Pi_e f \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{exp}}$. Hence, the expectations on the right-hand side of (4.7) exist and are finite. In addition, since $\{L \text{ odd}\} \in \mathcal{F}_\theta$ and $\mathbb{P}(L \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}) = 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[f(X_{\tau_J})] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}\left[f(X_{\tau_J})\middle|\mathcal{F}_\theta\right] 1_{\{L \text{ odd}\}}\right] + \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}\left[f(X_{\tau_J})\middle|\mathcal{F}_\theta\right] 1_{\{L \text{ even}\}}\right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left[\Pi_e f(X_\theta) 1_{\{L \text{ odd}\}}\right] + \mathbb{E}\left[\Pi_o \Pi_e f(X_\theta) 1_{\{L \text{ even}\}}\right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left[\Pi_e f(X_\theta)\mathbb{P}\left(L \text{ odd}\middle|X_\theta\right)\right] + \mathbb{E}\left[\Pi_o \Pi_e f(X_\theta)\mathbb{P}\left(L \text{ even}\middle|X_\theta\right)\right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left[\Pi_e f(X_\theta)\right] + \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\Pi_o \Pi_e f(X_\theta) - \Pi_e f(X_\theta)\right)\mathbb{P}(L \text{ even}|X_\theta)\right],
\end{aligned}$$

where (4.5) was used for the second inequality. □

4.2 The local error for functions of bounded variation

4.2.1 Functions of bounded variation

Definition 4.3 (Bounded variation)**.** For a function $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, let

$$T_f(x) := \sup \sum_{i=1}^{N} |f(x_i) - f(x_{i-1})|,$$

where the supremum is taken over all $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and all partitions

$$-\infty < x_0 < x_1 < \cdots < x_N = x.$$

One says that the function f has bounded variation, if $V(f) := \lim_{x\to\infty} T_f(x) < \infty$. The class of functions with this property will be denoted by BV.

A function $f \in BV$ is bounded and Borel measurable. In addition, it has left and right limits at each point $x \in \mathbb{R}$, both $\lim_{x\to-\infty} f(x)$ and $\lim_{x\to\infty} f(x)$ exist, and the discontinuity set of f is countable (see [10, Theorem 8.13 (b)]).

The following result is taken from [10, Theorem 8.13, Theorem 8.14].

Proposition 4.4. *Suppose that $f \in BV$ is left-continuous. Then there exists a unique constant $c \in \mathbb{R}$ and a unique signed Borel measure $\nu : \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}) \to \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$f(x) = c + \nu((-\infty, x)), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{4.8}$$

In addition, $T_f(x) = |\nu|((-\infty, x))$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, where by $|\nu|$ we denote the total variation measure associated to ν.

Using Proposition 4.4, one shows that a representation similar to (4.8) can be derived for every $f \in BV$. Indeed, suppose that $f \in BV$ and let $\Delta_f = (x_i)_{i\in\mathcal{I}}$ be the (countable) set of points, for which the left-continuity of f fails. Define $\varphi(x) := f(x-)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$; then $\varphi \in BV$ is left-continuous, and by Proposition 4.4 there exist a unique constant c and signed Borel measure ν such that $\varphi(x) = c + \nu((-\infty, x))$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Therefore, f can be represented as

$$f(x) = c + \nu((-\infty, x)) + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}} \Delta f(x_i) 1_{\{x_i\}}(x), \tag{4.9}$$

where $\Delta f(x_i) := f(x_i) - f(x_i-)$, and where $|\nu|(\mathbb{R})$ and $\sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}} |\Delta f(x_i)|$ are finite.

4.2.2 Estimation of the error for functions of bounded variation

Using the representation (4.9) and linearity, the problem of estimating the local error for functions of bounded variation essentially reduces to the estimation of step functions $1_{(y,\infty)}$ and jump functions $1_{\{y\}}$. Let us begin with a result that enables us to interchange the order of integration or summation and the application of the operator Π_e or Π_o.

Lemma 4.5. *Suppose that ν is a signed Borel measure on $\mathbb{R}$, $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ is a bounded Borel function, and $(x_i)_{i=1,2,\ldots}, (\alpha_i)_{i=1,2,\ldots} \subset \mathbb{R}$. In addition, suppose that $|\nu|(\mathbb{R}) < \infty$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |\alpha_i| < \infty$. Define*

$$I(x) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} \Pi_e \varphi(\,\cdot\,, y)(x) d\nu(y), \quad S(x) := \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \alpha_i \Pi_e 1_{\{x_i\}}(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Then, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$,

(i) *the integral $I(x)$ and the sum $S(x)$ exist and are finite,*

(ii) $I(x) = \Pi_e \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \varphi(\,\cdot\,, y) d\nu(y) \right)(x)$ *and* $S(x) = \Pi_e \Big(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \alpha_i 1_{\{x_i\}} \Big)(x)$,

(iii) $\Pi_e 1_{\{x_i\}}(x) = \frac{1}{4h} \big(|x - (x_i - 2h)| + |x - (x_i + 2h)| - 2\,|x - x_i| \big)$ *if* $x_i \in \mathbb{Z}_e^h$, *and* $\Pi_e 1_{\{x_i\}} \equiv 0$ *if* $x_i \notin \mathbb{Z}_e^h$. (4.10)

In addition, items (i) and (ii) remain valid if Π_e is replaced by Π_o.

Proof. Item (i) is clear, since f is bounded, $|\nu|(\mathbb{R}) < \infty$ and $\sum_i |\alpha_i| < \infty$. To show (ii), use the linearity of Π_e (and Π_o). For (iii), observe that $\Pi_e 1_{\{x_i\}} \equiv 0$ if $x_i \notin \mathbb{Z}_e^h$ holds by the definition of Π_e. On the other hand, if $x_i \in \mathbb{Z}_e^h$, then

$$\Pi_e 1_{\{x_i\}}(x) = \begin{cases} 0, & x < (x_i - 2h) \\ \frac{x-(x_i-2h)}{2h}, & (x_i-2h) \le x < x_i \\ \frac{(2h+x_i)-x}{2h}, & x_i \le x < (x_i+2h) \\ 0, & (x_i+2h) \le x \end{cases}, \tag{4.11}$$

so it suffices to verify that (4.11) agrees with the formula given in (4.10). □

For the remaining part of this subsection, we denote by $p = p(\,\cdot\,, \theta)$ the density of X_θ and by $q = q(\,\cdot\,, h, \theta)$ the function defined in (7.6).

Lemma 4.6. *Let $f \in BV$ be the function given by (4.9). Then*

$$\varepsilon_{h,\theta}^{\text{loc}}(f) = E^{(1)}(f) + E^{(2)}(f), \quad \textit{where}$$

$$(i) \quad E^{(1)}(f) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \big(\Pi_e 1_{(y,\infty)}(x) - 1_{(y,\infty)}(x)\big)\, p(x) dx d\nu(y) + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}: x_i \in \mathbb{Z}_e^h} \Delta f(x_i) \int_{\mathbb{R}} \Pi_e 1_{\{x_i\}}(x) p(x) dx, \tag{4.12}$$

$$(ii) \quad E^{(2)}(f) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \big(\Pi_o \Pi_e 1_{(y,\infty)}(x) - \Pi_e 1_{(y,\infty)}(x)\big)\, q(x) p(x) dx d\nu(y) + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}: x_i \in \mathbb{Z}_e^h} \Delta f(x_i) \int_{\mathbb{R}} R^{x_i}(x) q(x) p(x) dx. \tag{4.13}$$

The functions $\big\{R^{x_i} : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R} \,|\, i \in \mathcal{I}, x_i \in \mathbb{Z}_e^h\big\}$ are introduced in (4.15) below.

Proof. It holds by Corollary 4.2 that $\varepsilon_{h,\theta}^{\text{loc}}(f) = \tilde{E}^{(1)}(f) + \tilde{E}^{(2)}(f)$, where

$$\tilde{E}^{(1)}(f) := \mathbb{E}\big[\Pi_e f(X_\theta) - f(X_\theta)\big], \quad \tilde{E}^{(2)}(f) := \mathbb{E}\Big[\big(\Pi_o \Pi_e f(X_\theta) - \Pi_e f(X_\theta)\big) q(X_\theta)\Big],$$

since $q(X_\theta) = \mathbb{P}(L \text{ even} | X_\theta)$ $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. by Proposition 7.3. Hence it is enough to show that $\tilde{E}^{(1)}(f) = E^{(1)}(f)$ and $\tilde{E}^{(2)}(f) = E^{(2)}(f)$.

(i): By (4.9), Lemma 4.5 and Fubini's theorem, $\tilde{E}^{(1)}(f)$ is equal to

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[\int_{\mathbb{R}} \big(\Pi_e 1_{(y,\infty)}(X_\theta) - 1_{(y,\infty)}(X_\theta)\big) d\nu(y) + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \Delta f(x_i) \big(\Pi_e 1_{\{x_i\}}(X_\theta) - 1_{\{x_i\}}(X_\theta)\big)\Big]$$
$$= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \big(\Pi_e 1_{(y,\infty)}(x) - 1_{(y,\infty)}(x)\big)\, p(x) dx d\nu(y) + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}: x_i \in \mathbb{Z}_e^h} \Delta f(x_i) \int_{\mathbb{R}} \Pi_e 1_{\{x_i\}}(x) p(x) dx,$$

since $1_{\{x_i\}}(x) = 0$ for Leb-a.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and since $\Pi_e 1_{\{x_i\}} \equiv 0$ for $x_i \notin \mathbb{Z}_e^h$.

(ii): Similarly, one applies (4.9), Lemma 4.5 and Fubini's theorem to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{E}^{(2)}(f) &= \mathbb{E}\Big[\int_{\mathbb{R}} \big(\Pi_o\Pi_e 1_{(y,\infty)}(X_\theta) - \Pi_e 1_{(y,\infty)}(X_\theta)\big) q(X_\theta) d\nu(y) \\ &\qquad + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}} \Delta f(x_i) \left(\Pi_o\Pi_e 1_{\{x_i\}}(X_\theta) - \Pi_e 1_{\{x_i\}}(X_\theta)\right) q(X_\theta)\Big] \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}}\int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\Pi_o\Pi_e 1_{(y,\infty)}(x) - \Pi_e 1_{(y,\infty)}(x)\right) q(x)p(x)dxd\nu(y) \\ &\qquad + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}} \Delta f(x_i) \int_{\mathbb{R}} \big(\Pi_o\Pi_e 1_{\{x_i\}}(x) - \Pi_e 1_{\{x_i\}}(x)\big) q(x)p(x)dx. \end{aligned} \tag{4.14}$$

Clearly, $\Pi_o\Pi_e 1_{\{x_i\}}(x) - \Pi_e 1_{\{x_i\}}(x) \equiv 0$ if $x_i \notin \mathbb{Z}_e^h$. If $x_i \in \mathbb{Z}_e^h$, let $k_i := x_i/2h$, $(\beta_{k_i-1}, \beta_{k_i}, \beta_{k_i+1}) := (\frac{1}{4}, -\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{4})$, and define

$$R^{x_i}(x) := \sum_{m\in\{k_i-1,k_i,k_i+1\}} \frac{\beta_m}{h} d_o(x) 1_{[(2m-1)h,(2m+1)h)}(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{4.15}$$

while recalling that $d_o(x) = \mathrm{dist}(x, \mathbb{Z}_o^h)$ and $\mathbb{Z}_o^h = \{(2k+1)h : k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$. Observe that

$$\Pi_o\left|\cdot - 2mh\right|(x) - |x - 2mh| = d_o(x) 1_{[(2m-1)h,(2m+1)h)}(x) \tag{4.16}$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, so by the linearity of Π_o and (4.10) we obtain

$$\Pi_o\Pi_e 1_{\{x_i\}}(x) - \Pi_e 1_{\{x_i\}}(x) = R^{x_i}(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

□

Lemma 4.7. *Suppose that $f \in BV$ is given by (4.9) and $E^{(1)}(f)$ is as in (4.12). Then*

$$\left|E^{(1)}(f)\right| \le \Big(|\nu|(\mathbb{R}) + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}, x_i\in\mathbb{Z}_e^h} |\Delta f(x_i)|\Big) \frac{2}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \frac{h}{\sqrt{\sigma^2\theta}}.$$

Proof. Since $\left|\Pi_e 1_{(y,\infty)} - 1_{(y,\infty)}\right| \le 1_{[2kh,(2k+2)h)}$ for $y \in [2kh, (2k+2)h)$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$\left|\int_{\mathbb{R}} \Big(\Pi_e 1_{(y,\infty)}(x) - 1_{(y,\infty)}(x)\Big) p(x)dx\right| \le p(0)2h = \frac{2}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \frac{h}{\sqrt{\sigma^2\theta}}. \tag{4.17}$$

Furthermore, for every $x_i \in \mathbb{Z}_e^h$, equation (4.11) implies that

$$\left|\int_{\mathbb{R}} \Pi_e 1_{\{x_i\}}(x) p(x)dx\right| \le p(0) \int_{x_i-2h}^{x_i+2h} \Pi_e 1_{\{x_i\}}(x)dx = \frac{2}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \frac{h}{\sqrt{\sigma^2\theta}}. \tag{4.18}$$

The claim now follows by applying (4.17) and (4.18) to (4.12). □

Before estimating $\left|E^{(2)}(f)\right|$, we prove a result which allows us to rewrite the first item of (4.13) in a more convenient form.

Lemma 4.8. *If $y \in [2kh, (2k+2)h)$ for $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, then in terms of d_o (defined in (4.4)),*

$$\Pi_o \Pi_e 1_{(y,\infty)}(x) - \Pi_e 1_{(y,\infty)}(x) = \sum_{m \in \{k, k+1\}} \frac{(-1)^{m-k}}{4h} d_o(x) 1_{[(2m-1)h, (2m+1)h)}(x). \quad (4.19)$$

Proof. Suppose that $y \in [2kh, (2k+2)h)$ for a given $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then

$$\Pi_e 1_{(y,\infty)}(x) = \tfrac{1}{2} + \tfrac{1}{4h} |x - 2kh| - \tfrac{1}{4h} |x - (2k+2)h|, \quad (4.20)$$

which can be verified by checking that (4.20) agrees with the more transparent representation

$$\Pi_e 1_{(y,\infty)}(x) = \begin{cases} 0, & x \le 2kh \\ \frac{x-2kh}{2h}, & 2kh < x \le (2k+2)h \\ 1, & x > (2k+2)h \end{cases}.$$

Hence, by the linearity of Π_o and by (4.16), for every $x \in \mathbb{R}$ the following holds:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Pi_o \Pi_e 1_{(y,\infty)}(x) - \Pi_e 1_{(y,\infty)}(x) \\
&= \Pi_o \left(\frac{1}{2} + \sum_{m \in \{k, k+1\}} \tfrac{(-1)^{m-k}}{4h} |\cdot - 2mh| \right)(x) - \frac{1}{2} - \sum_{m \in \{k, k+1\}} \tfrac{(-1)^{m-k}}{4h} |x - 2mh| \\
&= \sum_{m \in \{k, k+1\}} \frac{(-1)^{m-k}}{4h} \left(\Pi_o |\cdot - 2mh|(x) - |x - 2mh| \right) \\
&= \sum_{m \in \{k, k+1\}} \frac{(-1)^{m-k}}{4h} d_o(x) 1_{[(2m-1)h, (2m+1)h)}(x).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 4.9. *Suppose that $f \in BV$ is given by (4.9) and $E^{(2)}(f)$ is as in (4.13). Then*

$$\left| E^{(2)}(f) \right| \le \left(|\nu|(\mathbb{R}) + 2 \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I} : x_i \in \mathbb{Z}_e^h} |\Delta f(x_i)| \right) \left(\frac{1}{3\sqrt{2\pi}} \frac{h}{\sqrt{\sigma^2 \theta}} + \frac{e^{-1/2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \frac{h^2}{\sigma^2 \theta} \right).$$

Proof. For each $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, define

$$\Psi_1(m) := \int_{(2m-1)h}^{(2m+1)h} \frac{d_o^2(x)}{h} p(x) dx \quad \text{and} \quad \Psi_2(m) := \int_{(2m-1)h}^{(2m+1)h} d_o(x) |\varrho(x)| p(x) dx,$$

where $d_o(x) = \operatorname{dist}(x, \mathbb{Z}_o^h)$, $\varrho(x) = q(x) - h^{-1} d_o(x)$, and where q is the function defined in (7.6). By the periodicity of the d_o, it holds uniformly in $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ that

$$\Psi_1(m) \le p(0) \int_{-h}^{h} \frac{d_o^2(x)}{h} dx \le \frac{2}{3} \frac{h^2}{\sqrt{2\pi\theta}}. \quad (4.21)$$

In addition, by Proposition 7.5,

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |\varrho(x)| \, p(x) \le \frac{h}{\sqrt{\sigma^2 \theta}} \max \left\{ p(0), \frac{2}{\sqrt{\sigma^2 \theta}} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |x| p(x) \right\} \le \frac{2e^{-1/2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \frac{h}{\sigma^2 \theta},$$

since $p(0) \leq \frac{2}{\sigma\sqrt{\theta}} \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}} |x|p(x) = \frac{e^{-1/2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \frac{2}{\sigma\sqrt{\theta}}$. Hence, again using the periodicity of d_o,

$$\Psi_2(m) \leq \frac{2e^{-1/2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \frac{h}{\sigma^2\theta} \int_{-h}^{h} d_o(x)dx = \frac{2e^{-1/2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \frac{h^3}{\sigma^2\theta}, \tag{4.22}$$

uniformly in $m \in \mathbb{Z}$.

In order to estimate the modulus of the first item of (4.13), use relation (4.19) and the inequality $q(x) \leq h^{-1}d_o(x) + |\varrho(x)|$ to show that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} \Big(\Pi_o \Pi_e 1_{(y,\infty)}(x) - \Pi_e 1_{(y,\infty)}(x) \Big) q(x)p(x)dx \right| \\
&\leq \sup_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} \sum_{m\in\{k,k+1\}} \frac{1}{4h} \int_{(2m-1)h}^{(2m+1)h} d_o(x)q(x)p(x)dx \\
&\leq \sup_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} \sum_{m\in\{k,k+1\}} \frac{1}{4h} \left(\Psi_1(m) + \Psi_2(m)\right) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{3\sqrt{2\pi}} \frac{h}{\sqrt{\sigma^2\theta}} + \frac{e^{-1/2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \frac{h^2}{\sigma^2\theta}
\end{aligned} \tag{4.23}$$

by (4.21) and (4.22). To estimate the modulus of the second item of (4.13), observe that for $x_i \in \mathbb{Z}_e^h$, by (4.15),

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} R^{x_i} q(x)p(x)dx \right| &\leq \sum_{m=k_i-1}^{k_i+1} \frac{|\beta_m|}{h} \int_{(2m-1)h}^{(2m+1)h} d_o(x)q(x)p(x)dx \\
&\leq \sum_{m=k_i-1}^{k_i+1} \frac{|\beta_m|}{h} (\Psi_1(m) + \Psi_2(m)) \\
&\leq \left(\frac{1}{4h} + \frac{1}{4h} + \frac{1}{2h}\right) \left(\frac{2}{3\sqrt{2\pi}} \frac{h^2}{\sqrt{\sigma^2\theta}} + \frac{2e^{-1/2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \frac{h^3}{\sigma^2\theta}) \right) \\
&= \frac{2}{3\sqrt{2\pi}} \frac{h}{\sqrt{\sigma^2\theta}} + \frac{2e^{-1/2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \frac{h^2}{\sigma^2\theta}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.24}$$

The proof is completed by applying upper bounds (4.23) and (4.24) to (4.13). □

Finally, we are in the position to prove the main result of this subsection.

Proposition 4.10. *Let $(h,\theta) \in (0,\infty)\times(0,T]$ and suppose that $f \in BV$ is given by (4.9). Then*

$$\left|\varepsilon_{h,\theta}^{loc}(f)\right| \leq \frac{8}{3\sqrt{2\pi}} C_h^{loc}(f) \frac{h}{\sqrt{\sigma^2\theta}} + \frac{2e^{-1/2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} C_h^{loc}(f) \frac{h^2}{\sigma^2\theta}, \quad \textit{where}$$

$C_h^{loc}(f) := |\nu|(\mathbb{R}) + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}: x_i\in\mathbb{Z}_e^h} |\Delta f(x_i)|$.

Proof. Apply Lemmata 4.6, 4.7 and 4.9 to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\varepsilon^{\mathrm{loc}}_{h,\theta}(f)\right| \\
&\leq \frac{2}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{h}{\sqrt{\sigma^2\theta}}C^{\mathrm{loc}}_h(f) + \left(|\nu|(\mathbb{R}) + 2\sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}:x_i\in\mathbb{Z}^h_e}|\Delta f(x_i)|\right)\left(\frac{1}{3\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{h}{\sqrt{\sigma^2\theta}} + \frac{e^{-1/2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{h^2}{\sigma^2\theta}\right) \\
&\leq \left(\frac{8}{3\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{h}{\sqrt{\sigma^2\theta}} + \frac{2e^{-1/2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{h^2}{\sigma^2\theta}\right)C^{\mathrm{loc}}_h(f).
\end{aligned}$$

□

In order to distinguish the general setting (h,θ) from a specific (n-dependent) setting, we will refer to the assumption below.

Assumption 4.11. *Given $\theta_0 := T - t_0 \in (0,T]$ and $n \in 2\mathbb{N}$, we substitute $(h,\theta) = (h_n,\theta_n)$, where*

$$h_n = \sigma\sqrt{\tfrac{T}{n}}, \quad \theta_n = \tfrac{n_\theta T}{n} \quad \text{and} \quad n_\theta = 2\lceil\tfrac{\theta_0}{2T/n}\rceil$$

as in (2.6). For notational convenience, we always write h instead of h_n.

Remark 4.12. The special choice $(h,\theta) = (h_n,\theta_n)$ of Assumption 4.11 affects the following objects used throughout the paper:

$$\begin{aligned}
\tau_k &= \inf\left\{t > \tau_{k-1} : |X_t - X_{\tau_{k-1}}| = h\right\}, \quad (X_{\tau_k})_{k=0,1,\ldots}, \quad (\mathcal{F}_{\tau_k})_{k=0,1,\ldots}, \\
J_n &= J = \inf\{2m \in 2\mathbb{N} : \tau_{2m} > \theta_n\}, \quad L_n = L = \sup\{m \in \mathbb{N}\cup\{0\} : \tau_m < \theta_n\}, \\
\mathbb{Z}^h_e &= \{2kh : k \in \mathbb{Z}\}, \quad \mathbb{Z}^h_o = \{(2k+1)h : k \in \mathbb{Z}\}, \quad \mathbb{Z}^h = \mathbb{Z}^h_o \cup \mathbb{Z}^h_e, \\
d_o(x) &= \mathrm{dist}(x,\mathbb{Z}^h_o), \quad d_e(x) = \mathrm{dist}(x,\mathbb{Z}^h_e), \quad p(x) = \tfrac{d}{dx}\mathbb{P}(X_{\theta_n} \in dx).
\end{aligned}$$

In addition, for the function $q = q(\,\cdot\,,h,\theta)$ defined in (7.3), by Proposition 7.3 it now holds that

$$q(x) = \mathbb{P}(L_n \text{ even} | X_{\theta_n} = x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}\backslash\mathbb{Z}^h.$$

Moreover, $\varrho(x) = q(x) - \frac{d_o(x)}{h}$ for the function $\varrho(\,\cdot\,,h,\theta)$ introduced in (7.12).

Recall from (2.9) that $\varepsilon^{\mathrm{loc}}_{n,t_0,x_0}(g) = \mathbb{E}[g(x_0+X_{\tau_{J_n}}) - g(x_0+X_{\theta_n})]$.

Corollary 4.13. *Suppose that Assumption 4.11 holds. In addition, suppose that $g \in BV$ has the representation (4.9). Then, for all $(t_0,x_0) \in [0,T)\times\mathbb{R}$ and $n \in 2\mathbb{N}$, it holds that*

$$\left|\varepsilon^{\mathit{loc}}_{n,t_0,x_0}(g)\right| \leq \frac{C^{\mathit{loc}}_{x_0,n}(g)}{\sqrt{n_\theta}},$$

where $C^{\mathit{loc}}_{x_0,n}(g) := \frac{3}{2}\left(|\nu|(\mathbb{R}) + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}:x_i-x_0\in\mathbb{Z}^h_e}|\Delta g(x_i)|\right)$ and $\mathbb{Z}^h_e = \left\{2k\sigma\sqrt{\frac{T}{n}} : k \in \mathbb{Z}\right\}$.

Proof. Let $f(x) := g(x_0 + x)$ and define a set function $\tilde{\nu}$ on $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ by $\tilde{\nu}(A) := \nu(x_0+A)$, $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$. It is clear that $\tilde{\nu}$ is a signed Borel measure, $|\tilde{\nu}|(\mathbb{R}) = |\nu|(\mathbb{R})$, and for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ it holds that

$$f(x) = c + \tilde{\nu}((-\infty, x)) + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}} \Delta g(x_i) 1_{\{x_i - x_0\}}(x).$$

But since $\left|\varepsilon^{\text{loc}}_{n,t_0,x_0}(g)\right| = \left|\varepsilon^{\text{loc}}_{h,\theta_n}(f)\right|$, by Proposition 4.10 we have

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\varepsilon^{\text{loc}}_{n,t_0,x_0}(g)\right| &\le \left(|\tilde{\nu}|(\mathbb{R}) + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}: x_i - x_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^h_e} |\Delta g(x_i)|\right)\left(\frac{8}{3\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{h}{\sqrt{\sigma^2\theta_n}} + \frac{2e^{-1/2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{h^2}{\sigma^2\theta_n}\right) \\ &\le \frac{3}{2}\left(|\nu|(\mathbb{R}) + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}: x_i - x_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^h_e} |\Delta g(x_i)|\right)\frac{1}{\sqrt{n_\theta}},\end{aligned}$$

since $\frac{8}{3\sqrt{2\pi}} + \frac{e^{-1/2}}{\sqrt{\pi}} \le \frac{3}{2}$ and $\frac{h}{\sqrt{\sigma^2\theta_n}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n_\theta}} \le \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ by Assumption 4.11. □

4.3 The local error for Lipschitz functions

Definition 4.14 (Lipschitz function)**.** A function $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is said to be Lipschitz function with the Lipschitz constant $K > 0$, if

$$|f(x) - f(y)| \le K\,|x - y| \quad \text{holds for all } x, y \in \mathbb{R}.$$

The class of such functions will be denoted by Lip.

By definition, $f \in Lip$ is continuous and hence also Borel measurable. Moreover, every $f \in Lip$ also belongs to $\mathcal{B}_{\text{exp}}$.

Proposition 4.15. *Let $f \in Lip$ with $K > 0$ as the Lipschitz constant. Then, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$,*

$$\begin{aligned}&(i) \quad |\Pi_e f(x) - f(x)| \le Kh \\ &(ii) \quad |\Pi_o \Pi_e f(x) - \Pi_e f(x)| \le 4Kh.\end{aligned}$$

As the result, for $\varepsilon^{loc}_{h,\theta}(f) = \mathbb{E}[f(X_{\tau_J}) - f(X_\theta)]$ defined in (4.1), it holds that

$$\left|\varepsilon^{loc}_{h,\theta}(f)\right| \le 5Kh. \tag{4.25}$$

Proof. (i) : Suppose that $x \in [2kh, (2k+2)h]$ for $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then, by the definition of Π_e,

$$\begin{aligned}|\Pi_e f(x) - f(x)| &\le \frac{(2k+2)h - x}{2h}\,|f(2kh) - f(x)| + \frac{x - 2kh}{2h}\,|f((2k+2)h) - f(x)| \\ &\le \frac{K}{2h} 2((2k+2)h - x)(x - 2kh) \le Kh,\end{aligned}$$

since $((2k+2)h - x)(x - 2kh) = d_e(x)(2h - d_e(x)) \le h^2$ for $d_e(x) = \text{dist}(x, \mathbb{Z}^h_e)$.

(ii) : Observe first that whenever $y, z \in [2mh, (2m+2)h]$ for some $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, then

$$|\Pi_e f(y) - \Pi_e f(z)| = \left|\frac{z-y}{2h} f(2kh) - \frac{z-y}{2h} f((2k+2)h)\right| \\ \leq \frac{|z-y|}{2h} 2Kh \leq 2Kh. \tag{4.26}$$

Therefore, for $x \in [2kh, (2k+2)h)$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, it holds that

$$|\Pi_o \Pi_e f(x) - \Pi_e f(x)| \\ = \left|\tfrac{(2k+1)h-x}{2h} [\Pi_e f((2k-1)h) - \Pi_e f(x)] + \tfrac{x-(2k-1)h}{2h} [\Pi_e f((2k+1)h) - \Pi_e f(x)]\right| \\ \leq \tfrac{(2k+1)h-x}{2h}(4Kh) + \tfrac{x-(2k-1)h}{2h}(4Kh) = 4Kh$$

by the triangle inequality and (4.26).

To show (4.25), notice that since $f \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{exp}}$, we can apply Corollary 4.2 together with items (i)–(ii) to conclude that

$$\left|\varepsilon^{\text{loc}}_{h,\theta}(f)\right| \leq \mathbb{E}\,|\Pi_e f(X_\theta) - f(X_\theta)| + \mathbb{E}\left[|\Pi_o \Pi_e f(X_\theta) - \Pi_e f(X_\theta)| \mathbb{P}(L \text{ even} | X_\theta)\right] \\ \leq Kh + 4Kh\mathbb{P}(L \text{ even}) \leq 5Kh.$$

□

Corollary 4.16. *Suppose that $g \in Lip$ with $K > 0$ as the Lipschitz constant, and that Assumption 4.11 holds. Then, for all $(t_0, x_0) \in [0, T) \times \mathbb{R}$ and $n \in 2\mathbb{N}$, it holds that*

$$\left|\varepsilon^{loc}_{n,t_0,x_0}(g)\right| \leq \frac{5K\sigma\sqrt{T}}{\sqrt{n}},$$

where $\varepsilon^{loc}_{n,t_0,x_0}(g) = \mathbb{E}[g(x_0+X_{\tau_{J_n}}) - g(x_0+X_{\theta_n})]$ as defined in (2.9).

Proof. Suppose that $g \in Lip$ and define $f(x) := g(x_0+x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$; then $f \in Lip$ with the same constant $K > 0$. By Assumption 4.11 it holds that $(h, \theta) = (\sigma\sqrt{T/n}, \theta_n)$, so the claim follows by Proposition 4.15, since $\left|\varepsilon^{\text{loc}}_{n,t_0,x_0}(g)\right| = \left|\varepsilon^{\text{loc}}_{h,\theta_n}(f)\right|$. □

5 The global error

Our aim is to find an upper bound for the global error,

$$\varepsilon^{\text{glob}}_{n,t_0,x_0}(g) = \mathbb{E}[g(x_0+X_{\tau_{n_\theta}}) - g(x_0+X_{\tau_{J_n}})], \tag{5.1}$$

where g is an exponentially bounded Borel function, and $(X_{\tau_k})_{k=0,1,\ldots}$ is the random walk considered in Subsection (2.1). Derivation of this bound is presented in Subsection 5.2. For this purpose, we need a collection of estimates related to the behavior of the random walk (X_{τ_k}). Part of these are given in 5.1, while the more involved ones are proved later in Section 6.

NOTE: *We take Assumption 4.11 as a standing assumption throughout Section 5.*

5.1 Estimates related to the random walk

Let us recall from (2.7) that $J_n(\omega) := \inf\{2m \in 2\mathbb{N} : \tau_{2m}(\omega) > \theta_n\}$.

Lemma 5.1. *For any $b > 0$, it holds that*

(i) $\quad \mathbb{E}\big[e^{b|X_{\tau_{n_\theta}}|}\big] \le 2e^{\frac{1}{2}b^2\sigma^2 T}$.

(ii) $\quad \mathbb{E}\big[e^{b|X_{\tau_{J_n}}|}\big] \le 2e^{b\sigma\sqrt{2T}+\frac{1}{2}b^2\sigma^2 T}$.

Remark 5.2. A result similar to Lemma 5.1 was proved in [11, Corollary 11.4].

Proof. (i): Since $X_{\tau_{n_\theta}} = \sum_{k=1}^{n_\theta} \Delta X_{\tau_k}$, where $(\Delta X_{\tau_k})_{k=1,\dots}$ is an i.i.d. sequence with $\mathbb{P}(\Delta X_{\tau_k} = \pm h) = 1/2$ for $h = \sigma\sqrt{T/n}$ (see Remark 2.1),

$$\mathbb{E}\big[e^{b|X_{\tau_{n_\theta}}|}\big] \le 2\mathbb{E}\big[e^{bX_{\tau_{n_\theta}}}\big] = 2\left(\mathbb{E}\big[e^{b\Delta X_{\tau_1}}\big]\right)^{n_\theta} = 2\left(\cosh(bh)\right)^{n_\theta} \le 2e^{\frac{1}{2}b^2h^2n_\theta} = 2e^{\frac{1}{2}b^2\sigma^2\theta_n}$$

by the inequality $\cosh(x) \le e^{x^2/2}$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$. The claim follows, since $\theta_n \le T$.

(ii): Firstly, observe that by the definition of J_n we have $\left|X_{\tau_{J_n}} - X_{\theta_n}\right| \le 2h$. Secondly, since $\mathbb{E}\left[e^{u|Z|}\right] \le 2\mathbb{E}\left[e^{uZ}\right] = 2e^{u^2/2}$ for a standard normal Z random variable and for $u \in \mathbb{R}$, one has that

$$\mathbb{E}\big[e^{b|X_{\tau_{J_n}}|}\big] \le \mathbb{E}\big[e^{b|X_{\tau_{J_n}}-X_{\theta_n}|+b|X_{\theta_n}|}\big] \le e^{2bh}\mathbb{E}[e^{b\sigma\sqrt{\theta_n}|Z|}] \le 2e^{2b\sigma\sqrt{T/n}+\frac{1}{2}b^2\sigma^2T}.$$

□

Lemma 5.3. *Suppose that $f \in \mathcal{B}_{exp}$. Then, for all $p \in \mathbb{N}$, there exist constants $C_p > 0$ and $C_p(f) > 0$ such that*

$$(i) \quad \sup_{n,\theta_0} \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{|J_n - n_\theta|}{\sqrt{n_\theta}}\right)^p < C_p, \tag{5.2}$$

$$(ii) \quad \sup_{n,\theta_0} \mathbb{E}\left|\left(\frac{X_{\tau_{n_\theta}}}{\sqrt{\sigma^2\theta_n}}\right)^p f(X_{\tau_{n_\theta}})\right| < C_p(f). \tag{5.3}$$

Proof. Item (i) is a direct consequence of Lemma 6.5 below (use Jensen's inequality for the case $p = 1$). To show (ii), fix $p \in \mathbb{N}$. By Hölder's inequality it suffices to find constants $\tilde{C}(f), \tilde{C}_p > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{n,\theta_0} \mathbb{E}\left[f^2(X_{\tau_{n_\theta}})\right] \le \tilde{C}(f), \quad \sup_{n,\theta_0} \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{X_{\tau_{n_\theta}}}{\sqrt{\sigma^2\theta_n}}\right)^{2p} < \tilde{C}_p. \tag{5.4}$$

Since $f^2 \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{exp}}$, the first assertion of (5.4) follows by Lemma 5.1. For the second assertion, observe that

$$S_{n_\theta} := \frac{X_{\tau_{n_\theta}}}{\sqrt{\sigma^2\theta_n}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\sigma^2\theta_n}} \sum_{k=1}^{n_\theta} \Delta X_{\tau_k} \overset{d}{=} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n_\theta}} \sum_{k=1}^{n_\theta} \xi_i, \tag{5.5}$$

where $(\xi_i)_{i=1,2,\dots}$ is an i.i.d. Rademacher sequence (see Remark 2.1). Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[e^{tS_{n_\theta}}\right] = \left(\cosh(t/\sqrt{n_\theta})\right)^{n_\theta} \le e^{t^2/2}, \quad t \in \mathbb{R},$$

by the inequality $\cosh(u) \leq e^{u^2/2}$ for $u \in \mathbb{R}$. Hence, by the symmetricity of S_{θ_n} and Markov's inequality,

$$\mathbb{P}(|S_{n_\theta}| > t) = 2\mathbb{P}(S_{n_\theta} > t) = 2\mathbb{P}(e^{tS_{n_\theta}} > e^{t^2}) \leq 2e^{-t^2}\mathbb{E}\left[e^{tS_{n_\theta}}\right] \leq 2e^{-t^2/2}.$$

We obtain, uniformly in (n, θ_0),

$$\mathbb{E}|S_{n_\theta}|^{2p} = 2p\int_0^\infty t^{2p-1}\mathbb{P}(|S_{n_\theta}| > t)dt \leq 4p\int_0^\infty t^{2p-1}e^{-t^2}dt < \infty. \tag{5.6}$$

□

Lemma 5.4. *Under Assumption 4.11, for $p > 0$, there exist a constant $C_p > 0$ such that*

$$(i) \quad \sup_{n,\theta_0} n_\theta^p \mathbb{P}\big(\left|X_{\tau_{n_\theta}}/h\right| > n_\theta^{3/5}\big) \leq C_p,$$
$$(ii) \quad \sup_{n,\theta_0} n_\theta^p \mathbb{P}\big(|J_n - n_\theta| > n_\theta^{3/5}\big) \leq C_p.$$

Proof. (i): By (5.6), for all $q \in \mathbb{N}$ we find a constant $C_q > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{n,\theta_0} \mathbb{E}\,|S_{n_\theta}|^q \leq C_q,$$

where $S_{n_\theta} = \frac{X_{\tau_{n_\theta}}}{\sqrt{\sigma^2\theta_n}}$. But since $h\sqrt{n_\theta} = \sqrt{\sigma^2\theta_n}$, by Markov's inequality we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}\big(\left|X_{\tau_{n_\theta}}/h\right| > n_\theta^{3/5}\big) = \mathbb{P}\big(|S_{n_\theta}| > n_\theta^{1/10}\big) \leq \mathbb{E}\,|S_{n_\theta}|^q\, n_\theta^{-q/10} \leq C_q n_\theta^{-q/10} \tag{5.7}$$

for all $q \in \mathbb{N}$. Choose $q > 10p$ and multiply both sides of (5.7) by n_θ^p to complete the proof.

(ii): For every $2 \leq K \in \mathbb{N}$, by Markov's inequality and Lemma 6.5 below, it holds that

$$\mathbb{P}\big(|J_n - n_\theta| > n_\theta^{3/5}\big) \leq \mathbb{E}\,|J_n - n_\theta|^K\, n_\theta^{-3K/5} \leq C_K n_\theta^{-K/10} \tag{5.8}$$

for a constant $C_K > 0$. Choose $K > 10p$ and multiply both sides of (5.8) by n_θ^p to complete the proof. □

5.2 Estimation of the global error

This subsection is based on the proof of [11, Theorem 8.1]. The following shorthand notation for the probability mass functions of $h^{-1}X_{\tau_{n_\theta+k}}$ and $J_n - n_\theta$ will be used:

$$P_{n_\theta+k}(x) := \mathbb{P}(X_{\tau_{n_\theta+k}} = hx), \quad P^J_{n_\theta}(x) := \mathbb{P}(J_n - n_\theta = x), \qquad x \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

It is clear that

$$\mathrm{supp}P_{n_\theta+k} = \{m \in 2\mathbb{Z} : |m| \leq n_\theta + k\}, \quad \mathrm{supp}P^J_{n_\theta} = \{m - n_\theta : m \in 2\mathbb{N}\}. \tag{5.9}$$

The following proposition is the key ingredient in the estimation of the global error. Define the effective order $\breve{O}\left(\frac{k^p x^q}{n^r}\right)$ of a monomial $\frac{k^p x^q}{n^r}$ with $p, q, r \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ by letting

$$\breve{O}\left(\tfrac{k^p x^q}{n^r}\right) := \tfrac{p+q}{2} - r.$$

Proposition 5.5. *[[11], Proposition 11.5]*
Let $\mathcal{D}(R) := \{(n,k,x) \in 2\mathbb{N}\times 2\mathbb{Z}\times 2\mathbb{Z} : |k| \vee |x| \leq n^{3/5}\}$ *and define*

$$R : \mathcal{D}(R) \to \mathbb{R}, \quad R(n,k,x) := \frac{P_{n+k}(x)}{P_n(x)}, \tag{5.10}$$

$$R^{(1)} : 2\mathbb{N}\times 2\mathbb{Z}\times 2\mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{R}, \quad R^{(1)}(n,k,x) := \frac{k}{2n} - \frac{3k^2+4kx^2}{8n^2} + \frac{3k^2x^2}{4n^3} - \frac{k^2x^4}{8n^4}. \tag{5.11}$$

Then there exists a constant $C_0 > 0$ *and an integer* n_0 *such that for all* $(n,k,x) \in \mathcal{D}(R)$ *with* $n > n_0$ *it holds that*

$$\left|R(n,k,x) - [1 - R^{(1)}(n,k,x) + R^{(2)}(n,k,x)]\right| \leq \frac{C_0}{n^{3/2}}, \tag{5.12}$$

where $R^{(2)}$ *consists of a finite sum of monomials of effective order at most* $-3/2$.

Lemma 5.6. *Suppose that* $f \in \mathcal{B}_{exp}$ *and define*

$$\Gamma_{n_\theta} := \left\{\left|X_{\tau_{n_\theta}}/h\right| \vee |J_{n_\theta} - n_\theta| \leq n_\theta^{3/5}\right\}. \tag{5.13}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}\left[f(X_{\tau_{n_\theta}}) - f(X_{\tau_J}); \Gamma_{n_\theta}\right] \\ &= \sum_{k=2-n_\theta}^{\infty} \sum_{x=-n_\theta}^{n_\theta} f(xh) P^J_{n_\theta}(k) P_{n_\theta}(x) \left(1 - R(n_\theta,k,x)\right) 1_{\left\{|x|\vee|k| \leq n_\theta^{3/5}\right\}},\end{aligned} \tag{5.14}$$

where the function R *is given by (5.10).*

Proof. Since the processes $(\Delta\tau_k)_{k=1,2,\ldots}$ and $(\Delta X_{\tau_k})_{k=1,2,\ldots}$ are independent (see Remark 2.1), J_n and the process $(X_{\tau_k})_{k=0,1,\ldots}$ are also independent. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[f(X_{\tau_{J_n}})\right] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}[f(X_{\tau_k}); J_n = k]\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{k=2-n_\theta}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}[f(X_{\tau_{(n_\theta+k)}})] 1_{\{J_n - n_\theta = k\}}\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{k=2-n_\theta}^{\infty} \sum_{x=-(n_\theta+k)}^{n_\theta+k} f(xh) P_{n_\theta+k}(x) 1_{\{J_n - n_\theta = k\}}\right] \\ &= \sum_{k=2-n_\theta}^{\infty} \sum_{x=-(n_\theta+k)}^{n_\theta+k} f(xh) P_{n_\theta+k}(x) P^J_{n_\theta}(k)\end{aligned} \tag{5.15}$$

by (5.9) and by Fubini's theorem, which applies, since $\mathbb{E}\left|f(X_{\tau_{J_n}})\right| < \infty$ by Lemma 5.1. Observe that $\mathbb{E}\left|f(X_{\tau_{n_\theta}})\right|$ is also finite by Lemma 5.1. Therefore, by (5.15) and (5.9),

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\big[f(X_{\tau_{n_\theta}}) - f(X_{\tau_{J_n}})\big] \\
&= \sum_{x=-n_\theta}^{n_\theta} f(xh)P_{n_\theta}(x) - \sum_{k=2-n_\theta}^{\infty} \sum_{x=-(n_\theta+k)}^{n_\theta+k} f(xh)P_{n_\theta+k}(x)P^J_{n_\theta}(k) \\
&= \sum_{k=2-n_\theta}^{\infty} P^J_{n_\theta}(k)\Big\{ \sum_{x=-n_\theta}^{n_\theta} f(xh)P_{n_\theta}(x) - \sum_{x=-(n_\theta+k)}^{n_\theta+k} f(xh)P_{n_\theta+k}(x)\Big\} \\
&= \sum_{k=2-n_\theta}^{\infty} \sum_{x=-(k+n_\theta)}^{k+n_\theta} f(xh)P^J_{n_\theta}(k)\left(P_{n_\theta}(x) - P_{n_\theta+k}(x)\right). \qquad (5.16)
\end{aligned}$$

It remains to observe that by (5.10),

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\big[f(X_{\tau_{n_\theta}}) - f(X_{\tau_J}); \Gamma_{n_\theta}\big] \\
&= \sum_{k=2-n_\theta}^{\infty} \sum_{x=-(k+n_\theta)}^{k+n_\theta} f(xh)P^J_{n_\theta}(k)\left(P_{n_\theta}(x) - P_{n_\theta+k}(x)\right) 1_{\left\{|x|\vee|k|\le n_\theta^{3/5}\right\}} \\
&= \sum_{k=2-n_\theta}^{\infty} \sum_{x=-n_\theta}^{n_\theta} f(xh)P^J_{n_\theta}(k)\left(P_{n_\theta}(x) - P_{n_\theta+k}(x)\right) 1_{\left\{|x|\vee|k|\le n_\theta^{3/5}\right\}} \\
&= \sum_{k=2-n_\theta}^{\infty} \sum_{x=-n_\theta}^{n_\theta} f(xh)P^J_{n_\theta}(k)P_{n_\theta}(x)\left(1 - R(n_\theta,k,x)\right) 1_{\left\{|x|\vee|k|\le n_\theta^{3/5}\right\}}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 5.7. *Let $g \in \mathcal{B}_{exp}$. Given integers $p, q, r \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ and subsets $\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2 \subset \mathbb{Z}$, it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{k=2-n_\theta}^{\infty} \sum_{x=-n_\theta}^{n_\theta} g(xh)P^J_{n_\theta}(k)P_{n_\theta}(x)\frac{k^p x^q}{{n_\theta}^r} 1_{\{x\in\Lambda_1, k\in\Lambda_2\}} \\
&= n_\theta^{(p+q)/2-r}\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\tfrac{X_{\tau_{n_\theta}}}{\sqrt{\sigma^2\theta_n}}\right)^q g(X_{\tau_{n_\theta}}); X_{\tau_{n_\theta}}/h \in \Lambda_1\right]\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\tfrac{J_n-n_\theta}{\sqrt{n_\theta}}\right)^p; J_n - n_\theta \in \Lambda_2\right]. \qquad (5.17)
\end{aligned}$$

In addition, for every, $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ there exists a constant $C = C_{p,q,r,x_0}(g) > 0$ such that

$$\left|\sum_{k=2-n_\theta}^{\infty} \sum_{x=-n_\theta}^{n_\theta} g(x_0+xh)P^J_{n_\theta}(k)P_{n_\theta}(x)\frac{k^p x^q}{{n_\theta}^r} 1_{\left\{|x|\vee|k|>n_\theta^{3/5}\right\}}\right| \le C_{p,q,r,x_0}(g) n_\theta^{-3/2}. \qquad (5.18)$$

Proof. By the relation $\theta_n = \frac{n_\theta T}{n}$, for all $p, q, r \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ and $\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2 \subset \mathbb{Z}$, it holds that

$$
\begin{aligned}
&n_\theta^{(p+q)/2-r} \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\tfrac{X_{\tau_{n_\theta}}}{\sqrt{\sigma^2\theta_n}}\right)^q g(X_{\tau_{n_\theta}}); X_{\tau_{n_\theta}}/h \in \Lambda_1\right] \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\tfrac{J_n - n_\theta}{\sqrt{n_\theta}}\right)^p; J_n - n_\theta \in \Lambda_2\right] \\
&= \frac{n_\theta^{(p+q)/2-r}}{(\sigma^2\theta_n)^{q/2}} \mathbb{E}\left[X^q_{\tau_{n_\theta}} g(X_{\tau_{n_\theta}}); X_{\tau_{n_\theta}}/h \in \Lambda_1\right] \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\tfrac{J_n - n_\theta}{\sqrt{n_\theta}}\right)^p; J_n - n_\theta \in \Lambda_2\right] \\
&= {n_\theta}^{p/2-r} \frac{n^{q/2}}{(\sigma\sqrt{T})^q} \mathbb{E}\left[X^q_{\tau_{n_\theta}} g(X_{\tau_{n_\theta}}); X_{\tau_{n_\theta}}/h \in \Lambda_1\right] \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\tfrac{J_n - n_\theta}{\sqrt{n_\theta}}\right)^p; J_n - n_\theta \in \Lambda_2\right] \\
&= {n_\theta}^{p/2-r} h^{-q} \sum_{x=-n_\theta}^{n_\theta} (hx)^q P_{n_\theta}(x) g(xh) 1_{\{x \in \Lambda_1\}} \sum_{k=2-n_\theta}^{\infty} \frac{k^p}{{n_\theta}^{p/2}} P^J_{n_\theta}(k) 1_{\{k \in \Lambda_2\}} \\
&= \sum_{k=2-n_\theta}^{\infty} \sum_{x=-n_\theta}^{n_\theta} P^J_{n_\theta}(k) P_{n_\theta}(x) \frac{k^p x^q}{{n_\theta}^r} g(xh) 1_{\{x \in \Lambda_1, k \in \Lambda_2\}},
\end{aligned}
$$

where the application of Fubini's theorem was justified by Lemma 5.3. This proves (5.17).

To show (5.18), split the set $\{|x| \vee |k| > n_\theta^{3/5}\}$ into a disjoint union of sets $\{|x| > n_\theta^{3/5}\}$ and $\{|k| > n_\theta^{3/5}, |x| \le n_\theta^{3/5}\}$, and consider the corresponding sums separately. Notice that $g(x_0 + \cdot\,) \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{exp}}$ since $g \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{exp}}$.

In the case of $\{|x| > n_\theta^{3/5}\}$, by (5.17) and Hölder's inequality,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\left| \sum_{k=2-n_\theta}^{\infty} \sum_{x=-n_\theta}^{n_\theta} g(x_0 + xh) P^J_{n_\theta}(k) P_{n_\theta}(x) \frac{k^p x^q}{{n_\theta}^r} 1_{\left\{|x| > n_\theta^{3/5}\right\}} \right| \\
&= {n_\theta}^{\frac{p+q}{2}-r} \left| \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\tfrac{X_{\tau_{n_\theta}}}{\sqrt{\sigma^2\theta_n}}\right)^q g(x_0 + X_{\tau_{n_\theta}}); \left|X_{\tau_{n_\theta}}/h\right| > n_\theta^{3/5}\right] \mathbb{E}\left(\tfrac{J - n_\theta}{\sqrt{n_\theta}}\right)^p \right| \\
&\le {n_\theta}^{\frac{p+q}{2}-r} \left(\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\tfrac{X_{\tau_{n_\theta}}}{\sqrt{\sigma^2\theta_n}}\right)^{2q} g^2(x_0 + X_{\tau_{n_\theta}})\right] \right)^{1/2} \mathbb{P}\left(\left|X_{\tau_{n_\theta}}/h\right| > n_\theta^{3/5}\right)^{1/2} \mathbb{E}\left(\tfrac{|J - n_\theta|}{\sqrt{n_\theta}}\right)^p \\
&\le {n_\theta}^{\frac{p+q}{2}-r} C_{p,q,x_0}(g) \mathbb{P}\left(\left|X_{\tau_{n_\theta}}/h\right| > n_\theta^{3/5}\right)^{1/2} \qquad (5.19)
\end{aligned}
$$

for some constant $C_{p,q,x_0}(g) > 0$. Indeed, since $g(x_0 + \cdot\,) \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{exp}}$, such a constant exists by Lemma 5.3. It remains to observe that, by Lemma 5.4, there exists a constant $C_{p,q,r} > 0$ such that for all $n_\theta \in 2\mathbb{N}$,

$$
{n_\theta}^{\frac{p+q}{2}-r} \mathbb{P}\left(\left|X_{\tau_{n_\theta}}/h\right| > n_\theta^{3/5}\right)^{1/2} \le C_{p,q,r} n_\theta^{-3/2}.
$$

The case of $\{|k| > n_\theta^{3/5}, |x| \le n_\theta^{3/5}\}$ is similar: By (5.17) and Lemma 5.3, there exists a

constant $\tilde{C}_{p,q,x_0}(g) > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| \sum_{k=2-n_\theta}^{\infty} \sum_{x=-n_\theta}^{n_\theta} g(x_0+xh) P_{n_\theta}^J(k) P_{n_\theta}(x) \frac{k^p x^q}{{n_\theta}^r} 1_{\left\{|k|>n_\theta^{3/5}, |x|\le n_\theta^{3/5}\right\}} \right| \\
&= {n_\theta}^{\frac{p+q}{2}-r} \left| \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{X_{\tau_{n_\theta}}}{\sqrt{\sigma^2\theta_n}} \right)^q g(x_0+X_{\tau_{n_\theta}}); \left| X_{\tau_{n_\theta}}/h \right| \le n_\theta^{3/5} \right] \right| \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{J-n_\theta}{\sqrt{n_\theta}} \right)^p ; |J-n_\theta| > n_\theta^{3/5} \right] \\
&\le {n_\theta}^{\frac{p+q}{2}-r} \mathbb{E}\left| \left(\frac{X_{\tau_{n_\theta}}}{\sqrt{\sigma^2\theta_n}} \right)^q g(x_0+X_{\tau_{n_\theta}}) \right| \left[\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{|J-n_\theta|}{\sqrt{n_\theta}} \right)^{2p} \right]^{1/2} \mathbb{P}\left(|J-n_\theta| > n_\theta^{3/5} \right)^{1/2} \\
&\le \tilde{C}_{p,q,x_0}(g) {n_\theta}^{\frac{p+q}{2}-r} \mathbb{P}\left(|J-n_\theta| > n_\theta^{3/5} \right)^{1/2} \le \tilde{C}_{p,q,r,x_0}(g) n_\theta^{-3/2},
\end{aligned}$$

where Lemma 5.4 was applied for the last inequality. □

Lemma 5.8. *Let $g \in \mathcal{B}_{exp}$ and $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$. Then*

$$\left| \sum_{k=2-n_\theta}^{\infty} \sum_{x=-n_\theta}^{n_\theta} g(x_0+xh) P_{n_\theta}^J(k) P_{n_\theta}(x) R^{(2)}(n_\theta,k,x) 1_{\left\{|x|\vee|k|\le n_\theta^{3/5}\right\}} \right| \le C_{x_0}(g) n_\theta^{-3/2}, \tag{5.20}$$

where $R^{(2)}(n_\theta,k,x)$ is the finite sum of monomials, implicitly given by Proposition 5.5.

Proof. By the definition of $R^{(2)}$, there exist $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $(p_i)_{i=1}^N, (q_i)_{i=1}^N, (r_i)_{i=1}^N \subset \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ and $(\alpha_i)_{i=1}^N \subset \mathbb{R}$ such that $\frac{p_i+q_i}{2} - r_i \le -3/2$ for all $1 \le i \le N$, and

$$R^{(2)}(n_\theta,k,x) = \sum_{i=1}^N \alpha_i \frac{k^{p_i} x^{q_i}}{n_\theta^{r_i}} \quad \text{for all } (n_\theta,k,x) \in \mathcal{D}(R).$$

Therefore, by formula (5.17), the modulus of left-hand side of (5.20) can be rewritten and estimated by

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| \sum_{i=1}^N \alpha_i {n_\theta}^{\frac{p_i+q_i}{2}-r_i} \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{X_{\tau_{n_\theta}}}{\sqrt{\sigma^2\theta_n}} \right)^{q_i} g(x_0+X_{\tau_{n_\theta}}); X_{\tau_{n_\theta}}/h \le n_\theta^{3/5} \right] \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{J-n_\theta}{\sqrt{n_\theta}} \right)^{p_i} ; |J_n-n_\theta| \le n_\theta^{3/5} \right] \right| \\
&\le n_\theta^{-3/2} \sum_{i=1}^N |\alpha_i| \left| \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{X_{\tau_{n_\theta}}}{\sqrt{\sigma^2\theta_n}} \right)^{q_i} g(x_0+X_{\tau_{n_\theta}}) \right] \right| \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{|J-n_\theta|}{\sqrt{n_\theta}} \right)^{p_i},
\end{aligned}$$

and an application of Lemma 5.3 completes the proof. □

Lemma 5.9. *Let $g \in \mathcal{B}_{exp}$, $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and suppose that Γ_{n_θ} is as in (5.13). Then*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Big| \mathbb{E}\big[g(x_0+X_{\tau_{n_\theta}}) - g(x_0+X_{\tau_J}); \Gamma_{n_\theta} \big] \\
&\qquad - \sum_{k=2-n_\theta}^{\infty} \sum_{x=-n_\theta}^{n_\theta} g(x_0+xh) P_{n_\theta}^J(k) P_{n_\theta}(x) R^{(1)}(n_\theta,k,x) \Big| \le C_{x_0}(g) n_\theta^{-3/2}
\end{aligned} \tag{5.21}$$

for the function $R^{(1)}$ given by (5.11).

Proof. Firstly, observe that by (5.18), there exists a constant $C^{(1)}_{x_0}(g)$ such that

$$\left|\sum_{k=2-n_\theta}^{\infty}\sum_{x=-n_\theta}^{n_\theta} g(x_0{+}xh)P^J_{n_\theta}(k)P_{n_\theta}(x)R^{(1)}(n_\theta,k,x)1_{\left\{|x|\vee|k|>n_\theta^{3/5}\right\}}\right| \le C^{(1)}_{x_0}(g)n_\theta^{-3/2}. \tag{5.22}$$

Secondly, by (5.14), (5.12) and Lemma 5.8, there exist constants $C_0, C^{(2)}_{x_0}(g) > 0$ and $n_0 \in 2\mathbb{N}$ such that whenever $n_\theta > n_0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Big|\sum_{k=2-n_\theta}^{\infty}\sum_{x=-n_\theta}^{n_\theta} g(x_0{+}xh)P^J_{n_\theta}(k)P_{n_\theta}(x)R^{(1)}(n_\theta,k,x)1_{\left\{|x|\vee|k|\le n_\theta^{3/5}\right\}} \qquad (5.23)\\
&\qquad - \mathbb{E}\big[g(x_0{+}X_{\tau_{n_\theta}}) - g(x_0{+}X_{\tau_J});\Gamma_{n_\theta}\big]\Big|\\
&= \Big|\sum_{k=2-n_\theta}^{\infty}\sum_{x=-n_\theta}^{n_\theta} g(x_0{+}xh)P^J_{n_\theta}(k)P_{n_\theta}(x)\\
&\qquad \times \big[R^{(1)}(n_\theta,k,x) - (1-R(n_\theta,k,x))\big]1_{\left\{|x|\vee|k|\le n_\theta^{3/5}\right\}}\Big|\\
&\le C_0 n_\theta^{-3/2}\left|\sum_{k=2-n_\theta}^{\infty}\sum_{x=-n_\theta}^{n_\theta} g(x_0{+}xh)P^J_{n_\theta}(k)P_{n_\theta}(x)1_{\left\{|x|\vee|k|\le n_\theta^{3/5}\right\}}\right|\\
&\quad + \left|\sum_{k=2-n_\theta}^{\infty}\sum_{x=-n_\theta}^{n_\theta} g(x_0{+}xh)P^J_{n_\theta}(k)P_{n_\theta}(x)R^{(2)}(n_\theta,k,x)1_{\left\{|x|\vee|k|\le n_\theta^{3/5}\right\}}\right|\\
&\le C_0 n_\theta^{-3/2}\mathbb{E}\left[\left|g(x_0{+}X_{\tau_{n_\theta}})\right|;\left|X_{\tau_{n_\theta}}/h\right| \le n_\theta^{3/5}\right] + C^{(2)}_{x_0}(g)n_\theta^{-3/2} \qquad (5.24)\\
&\le C^{(3)}_{x_0}(g)n_\theta^{-3/2}, \qquad (5.25)
\end{aligned}$$

where $C^{(3)}_{x_0} := C_0 \sup_{n,\theta_0}\mathbb{E}\left|g(x_0{+}X_{\tau_{n_\theta}})\right| + C^{(2)}_{x_0}(g)$ is finite by Lemma 5.1. Here we applied (5.17) and (5.20) for the second last inequality. Hence we get the claim for all $n_\theta > n_0$ by the triangle inequality, (5.22) and (5.23). But obviously the supremum of the left-hand side of (5.21) over all $n_\theta \le n_0$ is bounded by some constant $C^{(4)}_{x_0}(g) > 0$. Therefore, by choosing $C_{x_0}(g) := C^{(1)}_{x_0}(g) + \max\left\{C^{(3)}_{x_0}(g), C^{(4)}_{x_0}(g)n_0^{3/2}\right\}$, the claim holds for all n_θ. □

Lemma 5.10. *Let $g \in \mathcal{B}_{exp}$ and $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$. Then there exists a constant $C_{x_0}(g) > 0$ such that*

$$\left|\mathbb{E}\big[g(x_0{+}X_{\tau_{n_\theta}}) - g(x_0{+}X_{\tau_{J_n}});\Gamma_n^{\complement}\big]\right| \le C_{x_0}(g)n_\theta^{-3/2}, \tag{5.26}$$

where $\Gamma_{n_\theta}^{\complement}$ is the complement of the set Γ_{n_θ} given by (5.13).

Proof. Since $\Gamma_n^{\complement} \subset \left\{\left|X_{\tau_{n_\theta}}/h\right| > n_\theta^{3/5}\right\} \cup \left\{\,|J_n - n_\theta| > n_\theta^{3/5}\right\}$, the modulus of the expectation presented in (5.26) can be upper bounded by the sum of the expectations below:

$$\begin{aligned}
E_1(n_\theta) &:= \mathbb{E}\Big[\left|g(x_0{+}X_{\tau_{n_\theta}}) - g(x_0{+}X_{\tau_{J_n}})\right|;\left|X_{\tau_{n_\theta}}/h\right| > n_\theta^{3/5}\Big],\\
E_2(n_\theta) &:= \mathbb{E}\Big[\left|g(x_0{+}X_{\tau_{n_\theta}}) - g(x_0{+}X_{\tau_{J_n}})\right|;|J_n - n_\theta| > n_\theta^{3/5}\Big].
\end{aligned}$$

Since $g^2(x_0+\cdot\,) \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{exp}}$, by Lemma 5.1, we find a constant $\tilde{C}_{x_0}(g) > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}\left|g(x_0+X_{\tau_{n_\theta}}) - g(x_0+X_{\tau_{J_n}})\right|^2 \le 2\mathbb{E}\left|g^2(x_0+X_{\tau_{n_\theta}})\right| + 2\mathbb{E}\left|g^2(x_0+X_{\tau_{J_n}})\right| \le \tilde{C}_{x_0}(g).$$

Therefore, by the inequality $(a+b)^2 \le 2a^2+2b^2$ and Hölder's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
&n_\theta^3 \left|\mathbb{E}\big[g(x_0+X_{\tau_{n_\theta}}) - g(x_0+X_{\tau_{J_n}}); \Gamma_n^{\complement}\big]\right|^2 \\
&\le n_\theta^3 (E_1(n_\theta) + E_2(n_\theta))^2 \\
&\le 2n_\theta^3 \left|E_1^2(n_\theta) + E_2^2(n_\theta)\right| \\
&\le n_\theta^3 \tilde{C}_{x_0}(g) \left[\mathbb{P}\left(\left|X_{\tau_{n_\theta}}/h\right| > n_\theta^{3/5}\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(|J_n - n_\theta| > n_\theta^{3/5}\right)\right] \\
&\le C_{x_0}(g)
\end{aligned} \tag{5.27}$$

for another constant $C_{x_0}(g) > 0$ implied by Lemma 5.4. It remains to take the square roots from the both sides of (5.27). □

Finally, we have the means to prove the main result of this section. Recall from (2.8) that $\varepsilon^{\text{glob}}_{n,t_0,x_0}(g) = \mathbb{E}[g(x_0+X_{\tau_{n_\theta}}) - g(x_0+X_{\tau_{J_n}})]$.

Proposition 5.11. *Suppose that $g \in \mathcal{B}_{exp}$ and $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$. Then there exists a constant $C_{x_0}(g) > 0$ such that for all $(n, \theta_0) \in 2\mathbb{N} \times (0, T]$,*

$$\left|\varepsilon^{\textit{glob}}_{n,t_0,x_0}(g)\right| \le \frac{C^{\textit{glob}}_{n_\theta,x_0}(g)}{n_\theta} + \frac{C_{x_0}(g)}{n_\theta^{3/2}}, \qquad \textit{where}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
C^{\textit{glob}}_{n_\theta,x_0}(g) := \frac{5}{12}\left|\mathbb{E}\left[g(x_0+X_{\tau_{n_\theta}})\right]\right| + \frac{1}{6}\left|\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\tfrac{X_{\tau_{n_\theta}}}{\sqrt{\sigma^2\theta_n}}\right)^2 g(x_0+X_{\tau_{n_\theta}})\right]\right| \\
+ \frac{1}{12}\left|\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\tfrac{X_{\tau_{n_\theta}}}{\sqrt{\sigma^2\theta_n}}\right)^4 g(x_0+X_{\tau_{n_\theta}})\right]\right|.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.28}$$

The coefficient $C^{\textit{glob}}_{n_\theta,x_0}(g)$ is bounded uniformly in (n, θ_0).

Proof. By (5.21) and (5.26), there exists a constant $C_{x_0}(g) > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\mathbb{E}[g(x_0+X_{\tau_{n_\theta}}) - g(x_0+X_{\tau_{J_n}})]\right| \\
&\le \left|\mathbb{E}[g(x_0+X_{\tau_{n_\theta}}) - g(x_0+X_{\tau_{J_n}}); \Gamma_{n_\theta}]\right| + \left|\mathbb{E}[g(x_0+X_{\tau_{n_\theta}}) - g(x_0+X_{\tau_{J_n}}); \Gamma_{n_\theta}^{\complement}]\right| \\
&\le \Big|\sum_{k=2-n_\theta}^{\infty} \sum_{x=-n_\theta}^{n_\theta} g(x_0+xh) P^J_{n_\theta}(k) P_{n_\theta}(x) R^{(1)}(n_\theta, k, x)\Big| + C_{x_0}(g) n_\theta^{-3/2}.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.29}$$

Moreover, an application of formula (5.17) to the double sums (corresponding to the mono-

mials included in $R^{(1)}$ given by (5.11)) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{k=2-n_\theta}^{\infty}\sum_{x=-n_\theta}^{n_\theta} g(x_0{+}xh)P^J_{n_\theta}(k)P_{n_\theta}(x)R^{(1)}(n_\theta,k,x)\\
&=\frac{1}{n_\theta}\Bigg\{\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}\left[g(x_0{+}X_{\tau_{n_\theta}})\right]\mathbb{E}[J_n{-}n_\theta]-\frac{3}{8}\mathbb{E}\left[g(x_0{+}X_{\tau_{n_\theta}})\right]\mathbb{E}\left(\tfrac{J_n-n_\theta}{\sqrt{n_\theta}}\right)^2\\
&\qquad-\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}\Big[\left(\tfrac{X_{\tau_{n_\theta}}}{\sqrt{\sigma^2\theta_n}}\right)^2 g(x_0{+}X_{\tau_{n_\theta}})\Big]\mathbb{E}[J_n{-}n_\theta]+\frac{3}{4}\mathbb{E}\Big[\left(\tfrac{X_{\tau_{n_\theta}}}{\sqrt{\sigma^2\theta_n}}\right)^2 g(x_0{+}X_{\tau_{n_\theta}})\Big]\mathbb{E}\left(\tfrac{J_n-n_\theta}{\sqrt{n_\theta}}\right)^2\\
&\qquad-\frac{1}{8}\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\tfrac{X_{\tau_{n_\theta}}}{\sqrt{\sigma^2\theta_n}}\right)^4 g(x_0{+}X_{\tau_{n_\theta}})\right]\mathbb{E}\left(\tfrac{J_n-n_\theta}{\sqrt{n_\theta}}\right)^2\\
&=\frac{1}{n_\theta}\Bigg\{\mathbb{E}\left[g(x_0{+}X_{\tau_{n_\theta}})\right]\left(\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}[J_n{-}n_\theta]-\frac{3}{8}\mathbb{E}\left(\tfrac{J_n-n_\theta}{\sqrt{n_\theta}}\right)^2\right)\\
&\qquad+\mathbb{E}\Big[\left(\tfrac{X_{\tau_{n_\theta}}}{\sqrt{\sigma^2\theta_n}}\right)^2 g(x_0{+}X_{\tau_{n_\theta}})\Big]\left(\frac{3}{4}\mathbb{E}\left(\tfrac{J_n-n_\theta}{\sqrt{n_\theta}}\right)^2-\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}[J_n{-}n_\theta]\right)\\
&\qquad-\frac{1}{8}\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\tfrac{X_{\tau_{n_\theta}}}{\sqrt{\sigma^2\theta_n}}\right)^4 g(x_0{+}X_{\tau_{n_\theta}})\right]\mathbb{E}\left(\tfrac{J_n-n_\theta}{\sqrt{n_\theta}}\right)^2\Bigg\}.
\end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 6.9, $\left|\mathbb{E}[J_n{-}n_\theta]-\frac{4}{3}\right|\le\frac{C^{(1)}}{\sqrt{n_\theta}}$ and $\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{J_n-n_\theta}{\sqrt{n_\theta}}\right)^2-\frac{2}{3}\right]\le\frac{C^{(2)}}{\sqrt{n_\theta}}$ for some constants $C^{(1)},C^{(2)}>0$, and hence

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}[J_n{-}n_\theta]-\tfrac{3}{8}\mathbb{E}\left(\tfrac{J_n-n_\theta}{\sqrt{n_\theta}}\right)^2-\frac{5}{12}\right|\le\frac{C^{(1)}+C^{(2)}}{\sqrt{n_\theta}},\\
&\left|\frac{3}{4}\mathbb{E}\left(\tfrac{J_n-n_\theta}{\sqrt{n_\theta}}\right)^2-\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}[J_n{-}n_\theta]-\left(-\tfrac{1}{6}\right)\right|\le\frac{C^{(1)}+C^{(2)}}{\sqrt{n_\theta}},\quad\text{and}\\
&\left|\frac{1}{8}\mathbb{E}\left(\tfrac{J_n-n_\theta}{\sqrt{n_\theta}}\right)^2-\frac{1}{12}\right|\le\frac{C^{(2)}}{\sqrt{n_\theta}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\left|\sum_{k=2-n_\theta}^{\infty}\sum_{x=-n_\theta}^{n_\theta} g(x_0{+}xh)P^J_{n_\theta}(k)P_{n_\theta}(x)R^{(1)}(n_\theta,k,x)\right|\le\frac{C^{\text{glob}}_{n_\theta,x_0}(g)}{n_\theta}+\frac{\tilde{C}_{x_0}(g)}{n_\theta^{3/2}},\tag{5.30}$$

where $C^{\text{glob}}_{n_\theta,x_0}(g)$ is as in (5.28), and $\tilde{C}_{x_0}(g)>0$ is a constant by Lemma 5.3. Hence, by (5.29) and (5.30), the proof is complete. □

6 Moment estimates for the stopping time J_n

Our objective is to prove moment estimates for the random variable

$$J_n=\inf\{2m\in2\mathbb{N}:\tau_{2m}>\theta_n\}$$

introduced in (2.7).

6.1 Tail behavior of τ_{n_θ} and $J_n - n_\theta$

Lemma 6.1. *Under Assumption 4.11, suppose that $n_\theta \in 2\mathbb{N}$ and $\xi > 0$ are such that $n_\theta\xi \in \mathbb{N}$. Then for every $\rho \in (0, \frac{\pi^2}{12}\xi\theta_n\sqrt{n_\theta})$ it holds that*

$$(i) \quad \mathbb{P}\left(\sqrt{n_\theta}(\tau_{n_\theta\xi} - \xi\theta_n) > \rho\right) \le \exp\left(-\tfrac{3}{2}\tfrac{\rho^2}{\xi\theta_n^2} H\left(\sqrt{\tfrac{3\rho}{\xi\theta_n\sqrt{n_\theta}}}\right)\right) \tag{6.1}$$

$$(ii) \quad \mathbb{P}\left(\sqrt{n_\theta}(\tau_{n_\theta\xi} - \xi\theta_n) < -\rho\right) \le \exp\left(-\tfrac{3}{2}\tfrac{\rho^2}{\xi\theta_n^2} H\left(\sqrt{\tfrac{3\rho}{\xi\theta_n\sqrt{n_\theta}}}\right)\right), \tag{6.2}$$

where $H : (0, \pi/2) \to \mathbb{R}$ *is given by* $H(x) := 1 + \frac{6}{x^4}\left(\frac{x^2}{2} + \log\cos x\right)$. (6.3)

Remark 6.2. The above estimates are non-trivial only whenever H is positive. Since $H(0+) = 1/2$, it holds that $H(x) > 0$ for small enough x. Notice that the condition $\rho \in (0, \frac{\pi^2}{12}\xi\theta_n\sqrt{n_\theta})$ ensures that $\sqrt{\frac{3\rho}{\xi\theta_n\sqrt{n_\theta}}} \in (0, \pi/2)$, which is the domain of H.

Proof of Lemma 6.1. The proof uses ideas from the proof of [11, Proposition 11.3].

(i): By Chebyshev's inequality, for any $\tilde\lambda, \tilde\rho > 0$ it holds

$$\begin{aligned} P_n^{(+)}(\tilde\rho) &:= \mathbb{P}\left(\sqrt{n_\theta}(\tau_{n_\theta\xi} - \xi\theta_n) > \tilde\rho\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(e^{\tilde\lambda\sqrt{n_\theta}(\tau_{n_\theta\xi} - \xi\theta_n)} > e^{\tilde\lambda\tilde\rho}\right) \\ &\le e^{-\tilde\lambda\tilde\rho}\mathbb{E}\left[e^{\tilde\lambda\sqrt{n_\theta}(\tau_{n_\theta\xi} - \xi\theta_n)}\right] = e^{-\tilde\lambda\tilde\rho}e^{-\tilde\lambda\sqrt{n_\theta}\xi\theta_n}\mathbb{E}[e^{\tilde\lambda\sqrt{n_\theta}\tau_1}]^{n_\theta\xi} \end{aligned} \tag{6.4}$$

since $\tau_{n_\theta\xi}$ can be written as a sum of $n_\theta\xi$ independent random variables identically distributed as τ_1 (see Remark 2.1). In addition, since $\frac{h}{\sigma} = \sqrt{\frac{T}{n}}$ and $\theta_n = \frac{n_\theta T}{n}$, by (2.2)

$$e^{-\tilde\lambda\tilde\rho}e^{-\tilde\lambda\sqrt{n_\theta}\xi\theta_n}\mathbb{E}[e^{\tilde\lambda\sqrt{n_\theta}\tau_1}]^{n_\theta\xi} = e^{-\tilde\lambda\tilde\rho}\left(e^{\frac{\tilde\lambda\theta_n}{\sqrt{n_\theta}}}\cos\left(\sqrt{\tfrac{2\tilde\lambda\theta_n}{\sqrt{n_\theta}}}\right)\right)^{-n_\theta\xi} \tag{6.5}$$

provided that $\tilde\lambda \in (0, \frac{\pi^2}{8T}\frac{n}{\sqrt{n_\theta}})$. Let $\rho \in (0, \frac{\pi^2}{12}\xi\theta_n\sqrt{n_\theta})$ and define

$$\lambda := \tfrac{3\rho}{2\xi\theta_n^2} \quad \text{and} \quad \kappa := \sqrt{\tfrac{3\rho}{\xi\theta_n\sqrt{n_\theta}}}; \tag{6.6}$$

then $\lambda \in (0, \frac{\pi^2}{8T}\frac{n}{\sqrt{n_\theta}})$. Substitute $(\rho, \lambda) = (\tilde\rho, \tilde\lambda)$ and use the relation $\kappa = \sqrt{\frac{2\lambda\theta_n}{\sqrt{n_\theta}}}$ in order to rewrite the right-hand side of (6.5) in terms of $(\rho, \lambda, \kappa, \xi)$:

$$e^{-\tilde\lambda\tilde\rho}\left(e^{\frac{\tilde\lambda\theta_n}{\sqrt{n_\theta}}}\cos\left(\sqrt{\tfrac{2\tilde\lambda\theta_n}{\sqrt{n_\theta}}}\right)\right)^{-n_\theta\xi} = e^{-\lambda\rho}\left(e^{\kappa^2/2}\cos\kappa\right)^{-\frac{4\lambda^2\theta_n^2\xi}{\kappa^4}}. \tag{6.7}$$

Hence by (6.4), (6.5), (6.7) and finally by (6.6),

$$\log P_n^{(+)}(\rho) \le -\lambda\rho - \tfrac{4\lambda^2\theta_n^2\xi}{\kappa^4}\left(\tfrac{\kappa^2}{2} + \log\cos\kappa\right) = -\tfrac{3}{2}\tfrac{\rho^2}{\xi\theta_n^2}\left(1 + \tfrac{6}{\kappa^4}\left(\tfrac{\kappa^2}{2} + \log\cos\kappa\right)\right)$$

so that $P_n^{(+)}(\rho) \le \exp\left(-\frac{3}{2}\frac{\rho^2}{\xi\theta_n^2}H(\kappa)\right)$ in terms of H defined in (6.3).

(ii): By Chebyshev's inequality, for any $\tilde{\lambda}, \tilde{\rho} > 0$ it holds that

$$P_n^{(-)}(\tilde{\rho}) := \mathbb{P}\left(\sqrt{n_\theta}(\tau_{n_\theta\xi} - \xi\theta_n) < -\tilde{\rho}\right) = \mathbb{P}\Big(e^{-\tilde{\lambda}\sqrt{n_\theta}(\tau_{n_\theta\xi}-\xi\theta_n)} > e^{\tilde{\lambda}\tilde{\rho}}\Big)$$
$$\leq e^{-\tilde{\lambda}\tilde{\rho}} e^{\tilde{\lambda}\sqrt{n_\theta}\xi\theta_n} \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\tilde{\lambda}\sqrt{n_\theta}\tau_{n_\theta\xi}}\right] = e^{-\tilde{\lambda}\tilde{\rho}}\left(e^{-\frac{\tilde{\lambda}\theta_n}{\sqrt{n_\theta}}}\cosh\left(\sqrt{\tfrac{2\tilde{\lambda}\theta_n}{\sqrt{n_\theta}}}\right)\right)^{-n_\theta\xi}, \quad (6.8)$$

by (2.2). Proceed as in (i) with the same substitution $(\tilde{\rho}, \tilde{\lambda}) = (\rho, \lambda)$ for $\rho \in (0, \frac{\pi^2}{12}\xi\theta_n\sqrt{n_\theta})$ and λ given by (6.6) to get as the counterpart of (6.7),

$$e^{-\tilde{\lambda}\tilde{\rho}}\left(e^{-\frac{\tilde{\lambda}\theta_n}{\sqrt{n_\theta}}}\cosh\left(\sqrt{\tfrac{2\tilde{\lambda}\theta_n}{\sqrt{n_\theta}}}\right)\right)^{-n_\theta\xi} = e^{-\lambda\rho}\left(e^{-\frac{\kappa^2}{2}}\cosh\left(\sqrt{\tfrac{3\rho}{\xi\theta_n\sqrt{n_\theta}}}\right)\right)^{-\frac{4\lambda^2\theta_n^2\xi}{\kappa^4}}$$

Similarly as in (i), one then shows that $P_n^{(-)}(\rho) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{3}{2}\frac{\rho^2}{\xi\theta_n^2}\hat{H}\left(\sqrt{\frac{3\rho}{\xi\theta_n\sqrt{n_\theta}}}\right)\right)$ in terms of the function $\hat{H}(x) := 1 + \frac{6}{x^4}\left(-\frac{x^2}{2} + \log\cosh x\right)$ on $(0, \pi/2)$. It remains to show that $\hat{H} \geq H$ on $(0, \pi/2)$. Since $\hat{H}(x) - H(x) = 6x^{-4}\left(-x^2 + \log\cosh(x) - \log\cos(x)\right)$ it suffices to show that

$$\varphi(x) := -x^2 + \log\cosh(x) - \log\cos(x) \geq 0. \quad (6.9)$$

First, $\varphi'(x) = -2x + \tanh(x) + \tan(x)$. Secondly,

$$\varphi''(x) = -2 + \frac{1}{\cosh^2(x)} + \frac{1}{\cos^2(x)} = \frac{\cos^2(x) + \cosh^2(x) - 2\cosh^2(x)\cos^2(x)}{\cos^2(x)\cosh^2(x)}$$
$$> \frac{(\cos(x) - \cosh(x))^2}{\cos^2(x)\cosh^2(x)} > 0$$

since $\cos(x)\cosh(x) < 1$ for $x \in (0, \pi/2)$. Hence φ' is increasing on $(0, \pi/2)$, and since also $\varphi'(0+) = 0 = \varphi(0+)$, (6.9) follows. □

We continue with the tail estimate for J_n. The result resembles inequality (42) in [11], but the time-dependent setting causes some changes.

Lemma 6.3. *Under Assumption 4.11, suppose that $n_\theta \in 2\mathbb{N}$, $\delta \in (0, \frac{\pi^2}{12+\pi^2})$, and let H be as in (6.3). Then*

$$(i) \quad \mathbb{P}(J_n > n_\theta(1+\delta)) \leq \exp\left(-\tfrac{3}{2}\tfrac{n_\theta\delta^2}{1+\delta}H\left(\sqrt{\tfrac{3\delta}{1+\delta}}\right)\right) \quad \text{if} \quad n_\theta(1+\delta) \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (6.10)$$

$$(ii) \quad \mathbb{P}(J_n < n_\theta(1-\delta)) \leq \exp\left(-\tfrac{3}{2}\tfrac{n_\theta\delta^2}{1-\delta}H\left(\sqrt{\tfrac{3\delta}{1-\delta}}\right)\right) \quad \text{if} \quad n_\theta(1-\delta) \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (6.11)$$

Proof. Fix $n_\theta \in 2\mathbb{N}$, $\delta \in (0, \frac{\pi^2}{12+\pi^2})$ and let $\rho := \delta\theta_n\sqrt{n_\theta}$. For (i), let $\xi := 1 + \delta$ and suppose that $n_\theta(1+\delta) = n_\theta\xi \in \mathbb{N}$. Then

$$\mathbb{P}(J_n > n_\theta\xi) = \mathbb{P}(\tau_{n_\theta\xi} < \theta_n) = \mathbb{P}(\sqrt{n_\theta}(\tau_{n_\theta\xi} - \xi\theta_n) < -\rho) \leq \exp\left(-\tfrac{3}{2}\tfrac{\rho^2}{\xi\theta_n^2}H\left(\sqrt{\tfrac{3\rho}{\xi\theta_n\sqrt{n_\theta}}}\right)\right)$$

by (6.2), since the choice of δ ensures that the pair (ξ, ρ) satisfies the assumptions of Lemma 6.1. To show (ii), let $\tilde{\xi} := 1 - \delta$ and suppose that $n_\theta(1-\delta) = n_\theta\tilde{\xi} \in \mathbb{N}$. Then by (6.1),

$$\mathbb{P}(J_n < n_\theta\tilde{\xi}) = \mathbb{P}(\tau_{n_\theta\tilde{\xi}} > \theta_n) = \mathbb{P}(\sqrt{n_\theta}(\tau_{n_\theta\tilde{\xi}} - \tilde{\xi}\theta_n) > \rho) \leq \exp\left(-\tfrac{3}{2}\tfrac{\rho^2}{\tilde{\xi}\theta_n^2}H\left(\sqrt{\tfrac{3\rho}{\tilde{\xi}\theta_n\sqrt{n_\theta}}}\right)\right)$$

since the pair $(\tilde{\xi}, \rho)$ satisfies the assumptions of Lemma 6.1 due to the choice of δ. □

6.2 Higher moment estimates for the difference $J_n - n_\theta$

For the convenience of the reader, we recall (see e.g. [5, Theorem 15.A.1]) the Azuma–Hoeffding inequality, which will be applied in the proof of Lemma 6.5.

Proposition 6.4 (Azuma–Hoeffding inequality)**.** *Suppose that $(M_j)_{j=0,1,\dots}$ is a martingale for which $M_0 = 0$, and for all $i \geq 1$ there exists a constant $\alpha_i > 0$ such that $|M_i - M_{i-1}| \leq \alpha_i \in \mathbb{R}$ a.s. Then, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and every $t > 0$,*

$$\mathbb{P}(M_k \geq t) \leq \exp\left(-\tfrac{t^2}{2\sum_{j=1}^k \alpha_i^2}\right).$$

Lemma 6.5. *Suppose that Assumption 4.11 holds, and let $K \geq 2$. Then there exists a constant $C_K > 0$ depending at most on K such that*

$$\mathbb{E}\,|J_n - n_\theta|^K \leq C_K n_\theta^{K/2} \quad \text{for all } (n, \theta_0) \in 2\mathbb{N} \times (0, T]. \tag{6.12}$$

Proof. Fix an integer $K \geq 2$. Since $|J_n - n_\theta|$ is a non-negative random variable,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\,|J_n - n_\theta|^K &= K\int_0^\infty z^{K-1}\mathbb{P}(|J_n - n_\theta| > z)dz \\ &= K\left(\int_0^2 i(z, n_\theta)dz + \int_2^{n_\theta} i(z, n_\theta)dz + \int_{n_\theta}^\infty i(z, n_\theta)dz\right) \\ &=: K(I_1(n_\theta) + I_2(n_\theta) + I_3(n_\theta))\end{aligned}$$

for the common integrand $i(z, n_\theta) = z^{K-1}\mathbb{P}(|J_n - n_\theta| > z)$. It suffices to show that for each $k \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ there exists a constant $C_K^{(k)} > 0$, depending at most on K, such that

$$I_k(n_\theta) \leq C_K^{(k)} n_\theta^{K/2} \quad \text{for all } n_\theta. \tag{6.13}$$

Step 1: $I_1(n_\theta)$**.** Since $K > 1$, (6.13) for $k = 1$ follows from the upper bound

$$I_1(n_\theta) = \int_0^2 z^{K-1}\mathbb{P}(|J_n - n_\theta| > z)dz \leq \int_0^2 z^{K-1}dz \leq 2^K/K := C_K^{(1)}.$$

Step 2: $I_2(n_\theta)$**.** Suppose that $n_\theta > 2$ and define $\delta_{n_\theta}(u) := \frac{2}{n_\theta}\lfloor\frac{n_\theta u}{2}\rfloor$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}I_2(n_\theta) &= \int_2^{n_\theta} z^{K-1}\mathbb{P}(|J_n - n_\theta| > z)dz = n_\theta^K \int_{2/n_\theta}^1 u^{K-1}\mathbb{P}(|J_n - n_\theta| > n_\theta u)du \\ &\leq n_\theta^K \int_{2/n_\theta}^1 u^{K-1}\mathbb{P}(|J_n - n_\theta| > \delta_{n_\theta}(u) n_\theta)du.\end{aligned} \tag{6.14}$$

Choose $a \in (0, 1]$ such that

$$\delta_{n_\theta}(u) < \tfrac{\pi^2}{12+\pi^2} \text{ and } H\left(\sqrt{\tfrac{3\delta_{n_\theta}(u)}{1+\delta_{n_\theta}(u)}}\right) \wedge H\left(\sqrt{\tfrac{3\delta_{n_\theta}(u)}{1-\delta_{n_\theta}(u)}}\right) > 1/4 \quad \text{hold for all } u \leq a, \tag{6.15}$$

where H was defined in (6.3). Depending on a, we split the right-hand side of (6.14) into a sum of the integrals

$$I_{2,1}(n_\theta) := n_\theta^K \int_{2/n_\theta}^{a} u^{K-1}\mathbb{P}(|J_n - n_\theta| > \delta_{n_\theta}(u)n_\theta)du \quad (\text{for } a > 2/n_\theta, \text{ otherwise } 0),$$

and

$$I_{2,2}(n_\theta) := n_\theta^K \int_{a\vee 2/n_\theta}^{1} u^{K-1}\mathbb{P}(|J_n - n_\theta| > \delta_{n_\theta}(u)n_\theta)du.$$

If $a \le 2/n_\theta$, then $I_{2,1}(n_\theta) = 0$. If $a \in (2/n_\theta, 1)$, by (6.15) and the fact that $n_\theta(1+\delta_{n_\theta}(u))$ and $n_\theta(1-\delta_{n_\theta}(u))$ are (even) integers, we can apply Lemma 6.3 and estimate

$$\begin{aligned} I_{2,1}(n_\theta) &= n_\theta^K \int_{2/n_\theta}^{a} u^{K-1}\Big[\mathbb{P}\big(J_n > n_\theta(1+\delta_{n_\theta}(u))\big) + \mathbb{P}\big(J_n < n_\theta(1-\delta_{n_\theta}(u))\big)\Big]du \\ &\le n_\theta^K \int_{2/n_\theta}^{a} u^{K-1}\left[\exp\left(-\tfrac{3}{8}\tfrac{n_\theta\delta_{n_\theta}^2(u)}{1+\delta_{n_\theta}(u)}\right) + \exp\left(-\tfrac{3}{8}\tfrac{n_\theta\delta_{n_\theta}^2(u)}{1-\delta_{n_\theta}(u)}\right)\right]du \\ &\le 2n_\theta^K \int_{2/n_\theta}^{a} u^{K-1}\exp\left(-\tfrac{3}{8}\tfrac{n_\theta\delta_{n_\theta}^2(u)}{1+\delta_{n_\theta}(u)}\right)du. \end{aligned} \tag{6.16}$$

By the properties of the floor function, for $u < 1$ it holds that

$$\frac{\delta_{n_\theta}^2(u)}{1+\delta_{n_\theta}(u)} = \frac{\left(\frac{2}{n_\theta}\lfloor\frac{n_\theta u}{2}\rfloor\right)^2}{1+\frac{2}{n_\theta}\lfloor\frac{n_\theta u}{2}\rfloor} \ge \frac{\left(\frac{2}{n_\theta}\left(\frac{n_\theta u}{2}-1\right)\right)^2}{1+u} > \frac{\left(u-\frac{2}{n_\theta}\right)^2}{2}, \tag{6.17}$$

and thus the right-hand side of (6.16) can be upper bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} &2n_\theta^K \int_{2/n_\theta}^{a} u^{K-1}e^{-\frac{3n_\theta(u-2/n_\theta)^2}{16}}du \le 2n_\theta^K \int_{0}^{1-2/n_\theta} \left(u+\tfrac{2}{n_\theta}\right)^{K-1}e^{-\frac{3n_\theta u^2}{16}}du \\ &\le 2^{K-1}n_\theta^K \int_{0}^{1-2/n_\theta} \left(u^{K-1} + (\tfrac{2}{n_\theta})^{K-1}\right)e^{-\frac{3n_\theta u^2}{16}}du. \end{aligned} \tag{6.18}$$

By substituting $x = u\sqrt{n_\theta}$ and by identifying the right-hand side of (6.18) as an integral with respect to a Gaussian kernel, one verifies that this integral multiplied by $n_\theta^{K/2}$ is upper bounded by some constant $\tilde{C}_K^{(2,1)} > 0$. As a consequence, $I_{2,1}(n_\theta) \le C_K^{(2,1)} n_\theta^{-K/2}$ for all n_θ and some constant $C_K^{(2,1)} > 0$ only depending on K.

Let us then consider the integral $I_{2,2}(n_\theta)$. If $a/3 \le 2/n_\theta$, then $n_\theta \le 6/a$, $a \le a \vee 2/n_\theta$,

and hence $I_{2,2}(n_\theta) \le \frac{6^K}{Ka^K}$. On the other hand, if $a/3 \in (2/n_\theta, 1)$, by Lemma 6.3,

$$\begin{aligned}
I_{2,2}(n_\theta) &= n_\theta^K \int_a^1 u^{K-1}\Big[\mathbb{P}\big(J_n > n_\theta(1+\delta_{n_\theta}(u))\big) + \mathbb{P}\big(J_n < n_\theta(1-\delta_{n_\theta}(u))\big)\Big]du \\
&\le n_\theta^K \int_a^1 u^{K-1}\Big[\mathbb{P}\big(J_n > n_\theta(1+\delta_{n_\theta}(a/3))\big) + \mathbb{P}\big(J_n < n_\theta(1-\delta_{n_\theta}(a/3))\big)\Big]du \\
&\le n_\theta^K \Big[\exp\Big(-\tfrac{3}{8}\tfrac{n_\theta\delta_{n_\theta}(a/3)^2}{1+\delta_{n_\theta}(a/3)}\Big) + \exp\Big(-\tfrac{3}{8}\tfrac{n_\theta\delta_{n_\theta}(a/3)^2}{1-\delta_{n_\theta}(a/3)}\Big)\Big]\int_a^1 u^{K-1}du \\
&\le 2n_\theta^K \exp\Big(-\tfrac{3}{8}\tfrac{n_\theta\delta_{n_\theta}(a/3)^2}{1+\delta_{n_\theta}(a/3)}\Big)\int_a^1 u^{K-1}du \\
&\le 2n_\theta^K \exp\Big(-\tfrac{3n_\theta(a/3-2/n_\theta)^2}{16}\Big).
\end{aligned}$$

Here we used the information that $u \mapsto \delta_{n_\theta}(u)$ is nondecreasing, the fact that $n_\theta(1+\delta_{n_\theta}(a/3))$ and $n_\theta(1-\delta_{n_\theta}(a/3))$ are (even) integers, condition (6.15) and inequality (6.17). As a result, there exists a constant $C_K^{(2,2)} > 0$ such that $I_{2,2}(n_\theta) \le C_K^{(2,2)}$ for all n_θ, and (6.13) for $k = 2$ follows.

Step 3: $I_3(n_\theta)$**.** We apply the Azuma–Hoeffding inequality to the tail distribution of $J_n = \inf\{2m \in 2\mathbb{N} : \tau_{2m} > \theta_n\}$. For every $i \in \mathbb{N}$, we let $\zeta_i := \frac{n}{T}\Delta\tau_i$. Then $(\zeta_i)_{i=1,2,\dots}$ is an i.i.d. sequence such that $\tau_m = \frac{T}{n}\sum_{i=1}^m \zeta_i$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$ (see Remark 2.1). Hence for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(J_n \ge 2m) = \mathbb{P}(\tau_{2m-2} \le \theta_n) &= \mathbb{P}\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{2m-2}\zeta_i \le n_\theta\Big) \le \mathbb{P}\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{2m-2}\zeta_i^N \le n_\theta\Big) \\
&= \mathbb{P}\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{2m-2}(c_N - \zeta_i) \ge (2m-2)c_N - n_\theta\Big), \qquad (6.19)
\end{aligned}$$

where $\zeta_i^N := \zeta_i \wedge N$, and where N is chosen such that $3/4 < c_N := \mathbb{E}[\zeta_i^N] < \mathbb{E}[\zeta_i] = 1$. Then $\left|\mathbb{E}\left[\zeta_i^N\right] - \zeta_i^N\right| \le N$ for all $i \ge 1$, and by (6.19) and the Azuma–Hoeffding inequality (Proposition 6.4),

$$\mathbb{P}(J_n \ge 2m) \le \exp\Big(-\tfrac{((2m-2)c_N - n_\theta)^2}{2(2m-2)N^2}\Big), \quad m \in \mathbb{N}. \qquad (6.20)$$

Let us then consider $I_3(n_\theta) = \int_{n_\theta}^\infty z^{K-1}\mathbb{P}\left(|J_n - n_\theta| > z\right)dz$. Since J_n is positive, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
I_3(n_\theta) &= \int_{n_\theta}^\infty z^{K-1}\mathbb{P}\left(J_n - n_\theta \ge z\right)dz \\
&= \int_{n_\theta}^{2n_\theta+2} z^{K-1}\mathbb{P}\left(J_n \ge z + n_\theta\right)dz + \sum_{m=3}^\infty \int_{(m-1)n_\theta+2}^{mn_\theta+2} z^{K-1}\mathbb{P}(J_n \ge z + n_\theta)dz \\
&\le \int_{n_\theta}^{2n_\theta+2} z^{K-1}\mathbb{P}\left(J_n \ge 2n_\theta\right)dz + \sum_{m=3}^\infty \int_{(m-1)n_\theta+2}^{mn_\theta+2} z^{K-1}\mathbb{P}(J_n \ge mn_\theta + 2)dz \\
&\le \int_{n_\theta}^{2n_\theta+2} z^{K-1}e^{-\frac{n_\theta}{2N^2}\frac{((2-2/n_\theta)c_N-1)^2}{(2-2/n_\theta)}}dz + \sum_{m=3}^\infty \int_{(m-1)n_\theta+2}^{mn_\theta+2} z^{K-1}e^{-\frac{n_\theta}{2N^2}\frac{(mc_n-1)^2}{m}}dz \\
&=: I_{3,1}(n_\theta) + I_{3,2}(n_\theta).
\end{aligned}$$

Since $c_N \in (3/4, 1)$, there exist constants $c, c' > 0$ such that

$$I_{3,1}(n_\theta) = \int_{n_\theta}^{2n_\theta+2} z^{K-1} e^{-\frac{n_\theta}{2N^2}\frac{((2-2/n_\theta)c_N-1)^2}{(2-2/n_\theta)}} dz \le 2(2n_\theta+2)^{K-1} e^{-\frac{n_\theta c}{N^2}} \le C_K^{(3,1)}$$

and

$$I_{3,2}(n_\theta) = \sum_{m=3}^{\infty} \int_{(m-1)n_\theta+2}^{mn_\theta+2} z^{K-1} e^{-\frac{n_\theta}{2N^2}\frac{(mc_N-1)^2}{m}} dz \le \sum_{m=3}^{\infty} (mn_\theta+2)^K e^{-n_\theta mc'} \le C_K^{(3,2)},$$

where $C_K^{(3,1)}, C_K^{(3,2)} > 0$ depend at most on K. This proves (6.13) for $k = 3$. □

6.3 Estimates for the first and the second moment of J_n

In order to represent the leading coefficient of the global error in Section 5 (see formula (5.28)), we need estimates for the first and the second moment of the random variable J_n. We begin by deriving an estimate for the expectation $\mathbb{E}[\tau_{J_n}]$ and then use martingale techniques to obtain estimates for $\mathbb{E}[J_n] - n_\theta$ and for $\mathbb{E}(J_n - n_\theta)^2$.

The results of this subsection are closely related to [11, Proposition 11.2].

Lemma 6.6. *Suppose that Assumption 4.11 holds. Then for all $(n, \theta_0) \in 2\mathbb{N} \times (0, T]$,*

$$\left| \mathbb{E}\big[\tau_{J_n}\big] - \theta_n - \frac{4}{3}\frac{T}{n} \right| \le \frac{17}{\sqrt{n_\theta}}\frac{T}{n}.$$

Proof. By Proposition 7.6, it holds

$$\mathbb{E}[\tau_{J_n} - \theta_n | X_{\theta_n} = x] = \sigma^{-2}(h^2 - d_o^2(x))\big(1 - q(x)\big) + \sigma^{-2}(2h^2 - d_e^2(x))q(x)$$

for Leb-a.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}$. For each $(h, \theta) \in (0, \infty) \times (0, T]$, define

$$I_1(h, \theta) := \sigma^{-2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} p(x)\Big(h^2 - d_o^2(x)\Big)(1 - q(x))dx, \tag{6.21}$$

$$I_2(h, \theta) := \sigma^{-2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} p(x)\Big(2h^2 - d_e^2(x)\Big)q(x)dx. \tag{6.22}$$

Then

$$\mathbb{E}[\tau_{J_n}] - \theta_n = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E}\left[\tau_{J_n} - \theta_n | X_{\theta_n} = x\right] p(x)dx = I_1(h, \theta_n) + I_2(h, \theta_n),$$

and by applying the result of Lemma 6.8 below, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| \mathbb{E}[\tau_{J_n}] - \theta_n - \frac{4}{3}\frac{T}{n} \right| \\
&\le \left| I_1(h, \theta_n) - \frac{5}{12}\frac{h^2}{\sigma^2} \right| + \left| I_2(h, \theta_n) - \frac{11}{12}\frac{h^2}{\sigma^2} \right| \le \left(\frac{23}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{h^3}{\sigma^3\sqrt{\theta_n}} + \frac{3h^4}{\sigma^4\theta_n} + \frac{24}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{h^5}{\sigma^5\theta_n^{3/2}} \right) \\
&\le \frac{h^2}{\sigma^2}\frac{h}{\sigma\sqrt{\theta_n}} \left(\frac{23}{\sqrt{2\pi}} + \frac{3h}{\sigma\sqrt{\theta_n}} + \frac{24}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \left(\frac{h}{\sigma\sqrt{\theta_n}} \right)^2 \right) \le \frac{17}{\sqrt{n_\theta}}\frac{T}{n},
\end{aligned}$$

since $\frac{h^2}{\sigma^2} = \frac{T}{n}$, $\frac{h}{\sigma\sqrt{\theta_n}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n_\theta}} \le \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ and $\frac{35+3\sqrt{\pi}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} < 17$. □

For the proof of Lemma 6.8, we need the following auxiliary result.

Lemma 6.7. *Let $(h,\theta) \in (0,\infty)\times(0,T]$ and denote by p be the density of $X_\theta = \sigma W_\theta$. Then*

$$(i) \quad \Big|\sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} 2hp((2m+1)h) - 1\Big| \le \frac{6h}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2\theta}}, \tag{6.23}$$

$$(ii) \quad \Big|\sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} 2hp(2mh) - 1\Big| \le \frac{8h}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2\theta}}. \tag{6.24}$$

Proof. (i): By the symmetry of the Gaussian density p, it holds that

$$S := \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} 2hp((2m+1)h) = 4hp(h) + 2\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} 2hp((2m+1)h). \tag{6.25}$$

In addition, since p is decreasing on $[0,\infty)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{3h}^{\infty} p(x)dx &= \sum_{m=1}^{\infty}\int_{(2m+1)h}^{(2m+3)h} p(x)dx \\ &\le \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} 2hp((2m+1)h) \le \sum_{m=1}^{\infty}\int_{(2m-1)h}^{(2m+1)h} p(x)dx = \int_{h}^{\infty} p(x)dx,\end{aligned}$$

which together with (6.25) imply that

$$\int_{-h}^{h} p(x)dx - 4hp(h) \le \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} p(x)dx - S \le \int_{-3h}^{3h} p(x)dx - 4hp(h). \tag{6.26}$$

For $\beta > 0$, by the mean value theorem there exists a constant $\xi = \xi(h,\sigma,\theta,\beta) \in (-\beta h, \beta h)$ such that

$$\int_{-\beta h}^{\beta h} e^{-\frac{x^2}{2\sigma^2\theta}}dx = 2\beta h e^{-\frac{\xi^2}{2\sigma^2\theta}}.$$

This fact together with (6.26) imply that $\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2\theta}\left|\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} p(x)dx - S\right| \le 6h$, proving (i).

(ii): Using similar arguments as in the proof of item (i), one first shows that

$$\int_{4h}^{\infty} p(x)dx \le \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} 2hp(2mh) \le \int_{2h}^{\infty} p(x)dx,$$

which then implies that for

$$\tilde{S} := \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} 2hp((2mh)) = 2hp(0) + 4hp(2h) + 2\sum_{m=2}^{\infty} 2hp(2mh)$$

the estimate $\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2\theta}\left|\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} p(x)dx - \tilde{S}\right| \le 8h$ holds true. □

For the following lemma, recall the definitions of the functions q, d_o, d_e, and ϱ given by (7.6) ,(4.4) and (7.12).

Lemma 6.8. *Let $(h,\theta) \in (0,\infty)\times(0,T]$ and denote by p the density of X_θ. Then, for I_1 and I_2 defined in (6.21) and (6.22), respectively, it holds that*

$$(i) \quad \Big|I_1(h,\theta) - \frac{5}{12}\frac{h^2}{\sigma^2}\Big| \le \frac{15}{2\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{h^3}{\sigma^3\sqrt{\theta}} + \frac{h^4}{\sigma^4\theta} + \frac{8}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{h^5}{\sigma^5\theta^{3/2}},$$
$$(ii) \quad \Big|I_2(h,\theta) - \frac{11}{12}\frac{h^2}{\sigma^2}\Big| \le \frac{31}{2\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{h^3}{\sigma^3\sqrt{\theta}} + \frac{2h^4}{\sigma^4\theta} + \frac{16}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{h^5}{\sigma^5\theta^{3/2}}.$$

Proof. (i): Since $1-q(x) = h^{-1}(h-d_o(x)) - \varrho(x)$ for $x\in\mathbb{R}$ by the definition of ϱ, we may decompose $I_1(h,\theta) = S_1 + S_2$, where

$$S_1 := \sigma^{-2}\sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty}\int_{2mh}^{(2m+2)h} p(x)\Big(h^2 - d_o^2(x)\Big)h^{-1}(h-d_o(x))dx,$$
$$S_2 := -\sigma^{-2}\sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty}\int_{2mh}^{(2m+2)h} p(x)\Big(h^2 - d_o^2(x)\Big)\varrho(x)dx. \tag{6.27}$$

Let $\mathcal{D}(x) := \Big(h^2 - d_o^2(x)\Big)h^{-1}(h-d_o(x))$, $x\in\mathbb{R}$. We use the fact that $\mathcal{D}$ is symmetric, periodic with period $2h$ and symmetric around h on $[0,2h]$, and write

$$S_1 = S_{1,1} + S_{1,2}, \qquad \text{where}$$

$$S_{1,1} := \sigma^{-2}\sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} p((2m+1)h)\int_0^{2h}\mathcal{D}(x)dx, \tag{6.28}$$
$$S_{1,2} := \sigma^{-2}\sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty}\int_{2mh}^{(2m+2)h}\big(p(x) - p((2m+1)h)\big)\mathcal{D}(x)dx. \tag{6.29}$$

A standard calculation yields $\int_0^{2h}\mathcal{D}(x)dx = 5h^3/6$, and since

$$S_{1,1} = \frac{5}{12}\frac{h^2}{\sigma^2}\sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} 2hp((2m+1)h) = \frac{5}{12}\frac{h^2}{\sigma^2} + \frac{5}{12}\frac{h^2}{\sigma^2}\Big(\sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} 2hp((2m+1)h) - 1\Big),$$

inequality (6.23) implies that

$$\Big|S_{1,1} - \frac{5}{12}\frac{h^2}{\sigma^2}\Big| \le \frac{5}{2\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{h^3}{\sigma^3\sqrt{\theta}}. \tag{6.30}$$

In order to estimate $S_{1,2}$, let $\Delta_m(x) := p(x) - p((2m+1)h)$ on $(2mh,(2m+2)h)$ for all $m\in\mathbb{Z}$. We claim that

$$\sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty}\int_{2mh}^{(2m+2)h}\Delta_m(x)\mathcal{D}(x)dx = 2\sum_{m=0}^{\infty}\int_{2mh}^{(2m+2)h}\Delta_m(x)\mathcal{D}(x)dx.$$

This is the result of following observation: for each $m \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$,

$$\int_{-2mh}^{(-2m+2)h} (p(x) - p((-2m+1)h)\,\mathcal{D}(x)dx = \int_{(2m-2)h}^{2mh} (p(-x) - p((2m-1)h))\,\mathcal{D}(-x)dx$$
$$= \int_{(2m-2)h}^{2mh} (p(x) - p((2m-1)h))\,\mathcal{D}(x)dx$$

by the symmetry of p and $\mathcal{D}$.

Hence it suffices to derive upper and lower estimates for the integrals

$$\Psi_m := \int_{2mh}^{(2m+2)h} \Delta_m(x)\mathcal{D}(x)dx \quad \text{for} \quad m \geq 0.$$

Suppose that $m \geq 0$. If $x \in [2mh, (2m+1)h]$, the mean value theorem implies the existence of $\xi \in (x, (2m+1)h)$ such that

$$\Delta_m(x) = p'(\xi)(x - (2m+1)h) = -\frac{\xi}{\sigma^2\theta}p(\xi)(x - (2m+1)h)$$
$$\leq \frac{(2m+1)h}{\sigma^2\theta}p(2mh)d_o(x).$$

Similarly, for $x \in [(2m+1)h, (2m+2)h]$ there exists $\tilde{\xi} \in ((2m+1)h, x)$ such that

$$\Delta_m(x) = -\frac{\tilde{\xi}}{\sigma^2\theta}p(\tilde{\xi})d_o(x) \leq -\frac{(2m+1)h}{\sigma^2\theta}p((2m+2)h)d_o(x).$$

This provides the upper bound

$$\Psi_m \leq \left(\frac{(2m+1)h}{\sigma^2\theta}p(2mh) - \frac{(2m+1)h}{\sigma^2\theta}p((2m+2)h)\right)\int_0^h d_o(x)\mathcal{D}(x)dx$$
$$\leq \frac{h^4}{\sigma^2\theta}(2m+1)h\big(p(2mh) - p((2m+2)h)\big), \tag{6.31}$$

where we used the perdiodicity and the symmetricity of $x \mapsto d_o(x)\mathcal{D}(x)$ and the estimate

$$\int_0^h d_o(x)\mathcal{D}(x)dx = h^3\int_0^h \left(1 - \frac{d_o^2(x)}{h^2}\right)\left(1 - \frac{d_o(x)}{h}\right)\frac{d_o(x)}{h}dx \leq h^4.$$

In order to derive a lower estimate for Ψ_m, observe that for $x \in [2mh, (2m+1)h]$ and for some $\eta \in (x, (2m+1)h)$,

$$\Delta_m(x) = \frac{\eta}{\sigma^2\theta}p(\eta)d_o(x) \geq \frac{2mh}{\sigma^2\theta}p((2m+1)h)d_o(x).$$

Similarly, for $x \in [(2m+1)h, (2m+2)h]$ and for some $\tilde{\eta} \in ((2m+1)h, x)$,

$$\Delta_m(x) = -\frac{\tilde{\eta}}{\sigma^2\theta}p(\tilde{\eta})d_o(x) \geq -\frac{(2m+2)h}{\sigma^2\theta}p((2m+1)h)d_o(x).$$

Arguing as above, we thus obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi_m &\geq \left(\frac{2mh}{\sigma^2\theta}p((2m+1)h) - \frac{(2m+2)h}{\sigma^2\theta}p((2m+1)h)\right)\int_0^h d_o(x)\mathcal{D}(x)dx \\ &= -\frac{2h}{\sigma^2\theta}p((2m+1)h)\int_0^h d_o(x)\mathcal{D}(x)dx \geq -\frac{h^4}{\sigma^2\theta}2hp((2m+1)h). \end{aligned} \tag{6.32}$$

Consequently, by (6.31) and (6.32),

$$-\frac{h^4}{\sigma^2\theta}\sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty}2hp((2m+1)h) \leq \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty}\int_{2mh}^{(2m+2)h}\Delta_m(x)\mathcal{D}(x)dx \leq \frac{h^4}{\sigma^2\theta}\sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty}2hp(2mh), \tag{6.33}$$

where the upper bound follows by observing that

$$2\sum_{m=0}^{\infty}(2m+1)h(p(2mh) - p((2m+2)h) = \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty}2hp(2mh)$$

since both of the series $\sum_{m=0}^{\infty}(2m+1)hp(2mh)$ and $\sum_{m=0}^{\infty}(2m+1)hp((2m+2)h)$ converge. By applying (6.23) to the left-hand side and (6.24) to the right-side of (6.33) one then obtains

$$-\frac{h^4}{\sigma^4\theta}\Big(1+\frac{6h}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2\theta}}\Big) \leq \frac{1}{\sigma^2}\sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty}\int_{2mh}^{(2m+2)h}\Delta_m(x)\mathcal{D}(x)dx \leq \frac{h^4}{\sigma^4\theta}\Big(1+\frac{8h}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2\theta}}\Big).$$

and as the result,

$$|S_{1,2}| \leq \frac{h^4}{\sigma^4\theta} + \frac{8}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{h^5}{\sigma^5\theta^{3/2}}. \tag{6.34}$$

It remains to estimate S_2 of (6.27). Using the inequality $h^2 - d_o^2(x) \leq h^2$ and the result of Proposition 7.5 for $|\varrho(x)|$,

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\sigma^2 S_2\right| &= \left|\sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty}\int_{2mh}^{(2m+2)h}p(x)\Big(h^2 - d_o^2(x)\Big)\varrho(x)dx\right| \\ &\leq h^2\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}p(x)\max\left\{1,\frac{2|x|}{\sigma\sqrt{\theta}}\right\}\frac{h}{\sigma\sqrt{\theta}}dx \\ &= \frac{h^3}{\sigma\sqrt{\theta}}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\max\left\{1,2|u|\right\}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}e^{-\frac{u^2}{2}}du \\ &\leq \frac{h^3}{\sigma\sqrt{\theta}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} + \frac{2}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{1/2}^{\infty}2ue^{-\frac{u^2}{2}}du\right) \\ &\leq \frac{5}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{h^3}{\sigma\sqrt{\theta}}. \end{aligned} \tag{6.35}$$

The claim now follows by using (6.30), (6.34) and (6.35) to the right-hand side of the estimate below,

$$\left|I_1(h,\theta)-\frac{5}{12}\frac{h^2}{\sigma^2}\right|\le\left|S_{1,1}-\frac{5}{12}\frac{h^2}{\sigma^2}\right|+|S_{1,2}|+|S_2|\,.$$

(ii): The proof of this item is similar to the proof of item (i), and thus we omit most of the details. Write $q(x)=h^{-1}d_o(x)+\varrho(x)$ and $I_2=S_3+S_4$, where

$$S_3:=\sigma^{-2}\sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty}\int_{2mh}^{(2m+2)h}p(x)\Big(2h^2-d_e^2(x)\Big)h^{-1}d_o(x),$$
$$S_4:=\sigma^{-2}\sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty}\int_{2mh}^{(2m+2)h}p(x)\Big(2h^2-d_e^2(x)\Big)\varrho(x)dx.$$

Let $\mathcal{H}(x):=\Big(2h^2-d_e^2(x)\Big)h^{-1}d_o(x)$ and decompose $S_3=S_{3,1}+S_{3,2}$, where

$$S_{3,1}:=\sigma^{-2}\sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty}p((2m+1)h)\int_0^{2h}\mathcal{H}(x)dx,$$
$$S_{3,2}:=\sigma^{-2}\sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty}\int_{2mh}^{(2m+2)h}(p(x)-p((2m+1)h)\mathcal{H}(x)dx.$$

The fact that $\int_0^{2h}\mathcal{H}(x)dx=\frac{11}{6}h^3$ and inequality (6.23) yield the estimate

$$\left|S_{3,1}-\frac{11}{12}\frac{h^2}{\sigma^2}\right|\le\frac{11}{2\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{h^3}{\sigma\sqrt{\theta}}.\tag{6.36}$$

Let $\Delta_m(x):=p(x)-p((2m+1)h)$ on $(2mh,(2m+2)h)$ for all $m\in\mathbb{Z}$. In order to analyze

$$S_{3,2}=\sigma^{-2}\sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty}\int_{2mh}^{(2m+2)h}\Delta_m(x)\mathcal{H}(x)dx,$$

as in the proof of item (i), one shows that

$$L\le\sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty}\int_{2mh}^{(2m+2)h}\Delta_m(x)\mathcal{H}(x)dx\le U\tag{6.37}$$

for the lower and upper sums

$$L:=-\frac{2h^4}{\sigma^2\theta}\sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty}2hp((2m+1)h),\quad U:=\frac{4h^4}{\sigma^2\theta}\sum_{m=0}^{\infty}(2m+1)h\big(p(2mh)-p((2m+2)h)\big),$$

where the factor h^4 originates from the upper estimate

$$\int_0^h d_o(x)\mathcal{H}(x)dx=h^3\int_0^h\frac{d_o^2(x)}{h^2}\left(2-\frac{h-d_o^2(x)}{h^2}\right)dx\le 2h^4.$$

Apply (6.23) and (6.24) to (6.37) to see that

$$-\frac{2h^4}{\sigma^2\theta}\Big(1+\frac{6h}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2\theta}}\Big) \le \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty}\int_{2mh}^{(2m+2)h}\Delta_m(x)\mathcal{H}(x)dx \le \frac{2h^4}{\sigma^2\theta}\Big(1+\frac{8h}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2\theta}}\Big),$$

and as a consequence,

$$|S_{3,2}| \le \frac{2h^4}{\sigma^4\theta}+\frac{16}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{h^5}{\sigma^5\theta^{3/2}}. \tag{6.38}$$

Finally, since $2h^2 - d_e^2(x) \le 2h^2$, by (6.35) one obtains

$$\left|\sigma^2 S_4\right| \le 2\left|\sigma^2 S_2\right| \le \frac{10}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\frac{h^3}{\sigma\sqrt{\theta}}. \tag{6.39}$$

To complete the proof, apply (6.36), (6.38) and (6.39) to the right hand side of

$$\left|I_2(h,\theta)-\frac{11}{12}\frac{h^2}{\sigma^2}\right| \le \left|S_{3,1}-\frac{11}{12}\frac{h^2}{\sigma^2}\right| + |S_{3,2}| + |S_4|\,.$$

□

Proposition 6.9. *Suppose that Assumption 4.11 holds. Then, for all $(n,\theta_0)\in 2\mathbb{N}\times(0,T]$, we have*

$$(i) \quad \left|\mathbb{E}[J_n] - n_\theta - \frac{4}{3}\right| \le \frac{17}{\sqrt{n_\theta}}, \tag{6.40}$$

$$(ii) \quad \left|\mathbb{E}\left(\tfrac{J_n-n_\theta}{\sqrt{n_\theta}}\right)^2 - \frac{2}{3}\right| \le \frac{C}{\sqrt{n_\theta}} \quad \textit{for some constant } C>0. \tag{6.41}$$

Proof. (i): Define a process $(M_k)_{k=0,1,\dots}$ by setting $M_k := \tau_k - k\mathbb{E}[\tau_1]$, $k=0,1,\dots$. Since $\tau_k = \sum_{j=1}^k \Delta\tau_j$ is a sum of k i.i.d. random variables $\Delta\tau_j$ distributed as τ_1, the process $(M_k)_{k=0,1,\dots}$ is a $(\mathcal{F}_{\tau_k})_{k=0,1,\dots}$-martingale. In addition, since J_n is a $(\mathcal{F}_{\tau_k})_{k=0,1,\dots}$-stopping time and since $J_n\wedge N$ is a bounded stopping time for all $N\in\mathbb{N}$, the optional stopping theorem implies that

$$0=\mathbb{E}\left[M_N\right]=\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}\left[M_N|\mathcal{F}_{\tau_{J_n\wedge N}}\right]\right]=\mathbb{E}[M_{J_n\wedge N}]=\mathbb{E}[\tau_{J_n\wedge N}]-\mathbb{E}[J_n\wedge N]\mathbb{E}[\tau_1],$$

i.e. $\mathbb{E}[J_n\wedge N]=\mathbb{E}[\tau_{J_n\wedge N}]/\mathbb{E}[\tau_1]$. Moreover, since $N\mapsto\tau_{J_n\wedge N}$ is increasing with τ_{J_n} as an integrable upper bound (by Lemma 6.6), the monotone convergence theorem implies that

$$\mathbb{E}[J_n]=\lim_{N\to\infty}\mathbb{E}[J_n\wedge N]=\lim_{N\to\infty}\frac{\mathbb{E}[\tau_{J_n\wedge N}]}{\mathbb{E}[\tau_1]}=\frac{\mathbb{E}[\tau_{J_n}]}{\mathbb{E}[\tau_1]}<\infty. \tag{6.42}$$

From $\mathbb{E}[\tau_1]=\frac{h^2}{\sigma^2}=\frac{T}{n}$ (see (2.3)) we conclude $\mathbb{E}[\tau_1]\left(\mathbb{E}[J_n-n_\theta]-\frac{4}{3}\right)=\mathbb{E}[\tau_{J_n}-\theta_n]-\frac{4}{3}\frac{T}{n}$, and the claim then follows by Lemma 6.6.

(ii): Let $\zeta := \theta_n + \inf\{t\ge 0 : |X_{t+\theta_n}-X_{\theta_n}|=2h\}$. Then by the strong Markov property and the scaling property of $(X_t)_{t\ge0}$,

$$\zeta-\theta_n \overset{d}{=} \inf\{t\ge0:|X_t-X_0|=2h\} \overset{d}{=} \inf\left\{t\ge0:\left|X_{t/4}-X_0\right|=h\right\} \overset{d}{=} 4\tau_1.$$

Since $\mathbb{P}(\tau_{J_n} \le \zeta) = 1$ and $\mathbb{E}[\tau_1^2] = \frac{5}{3}\frac{h^4}{\sigma^4} = \frac{5}{3}\frac{T^2}{n^2}$ by (2.3), it also holds that

$$0 \le \mathbb{E}(\tau_{J_n} - \theta_n)^2 \le \mathbb{E}(\zeta - \theta_n)^2 = 16\mathbb{E}[\tau_1^2] = \frac{80}{3}\frac{T^2}{n^2}. \tag{6.43}$$

By the definition of the process $(M_k)_{k=0,1,\dots}$,

$$\mathbb{E}[M_{J_n}^2] = \mathbb{E}(\tau_{J_n} - J_n\mathbb{E}[\tau_1])^2 = \mathbb{E}[\tau_{J_n}^2] - 2\mathbb{E}[J_n\tau_{J_n}]\mathbb{E}[\tau_1] + \mathbb{E}[J_n^2](\mathbb{E}[\tau_1])^2.$$

Moreover, since $\mathbb{E}[J_n] < \infty$, Wald's second identity applies and thus $\mathbb{E}[M_{J_n}^2] = \mathbb{E}[J_n]\mathrm{Var}[\tau_1]$. As a consequence,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[J_n^2] &= \frac{\mathbb{E}[J_n]\mathrm{Var}[\tau_1]}{(\mathbb{E}[\tau_1])^2} + \frac{2\mathbb{E}[J_n\tau_{J_n}]}{\mathbb{E}[\tau_1]} - \frac{\mathbb{E}[\tau_{J_n}^2]}{(\mathbb{E}[\tau_1])^2} \\
&= \tfrac{2}{3}\mathbb{E}[J_n] + \frac{2\mathbb{E}[J_n(\tau_{J_n}-\theta_n)]}{\mathbb{E}[\tau_1]} - \frac{\mathbb{E}(\tau_{J_n}-\theta_n)^2}{(\mathbb{E}[\tau_1])^2} \\
&\qquad + \frac{2\theta_n(\mathbb{E}[J_n] - \mathbb{E}[\tau_{J_n}]/\mathbb{E}[\tau_1])}{\mathbb{E}[\tau_1]} + \frac{\theta_n^2}{(\mathbb{E}[\tau_1])^2} \\
&= \tfrac{2}{3}\mathbb{E}[J_n] + \frac{2\mathbb{E}[J_n(\tau_{J_n}-\theta_n)]}{\mathbb{E}[\tau_1]} - \frac{\mathbb{E}(\tau_{J_n}-\theta_n)^2}{(\mathbb{E}[\tau_1])^2} + n_\theta^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{6.44}$$

since $\mathrm{Var}[\tau_1] = \frac{2}{3}(\mathbb{E}[\tau_1])^2$ and $\mathbb{E}[\tau_{J_n}] = \mathbb{E}[\tau_1]\mathbb{E}[J_n]$ by (6.42). Denote

$$\alpha_{n_\theta} := \frac{2\mathbb{E}[J_n(\tau_{J_n} - \theta_n)]}{\mathbb{E}[\tau_1]\mathbb{E}[J_n]},\ \beta_{n_\theta} := \frac{\mathbb{E}(\tau_{J_n} - \theta_n)^2}{(\mathbb{E}[\tau_1])^2} \text{ and } \gamma_{n_\theta} := \mathbb{E}[J_n] - n_\theta - \tfrac{4}{3}, \tag{6.45}$$

and observe that $\alpha_{n_\theta} \in [0,4], \beta_{n_\theta} \in [0, 80/3]$ and $|\gamma_{n_\theta}| \in [0, \frac{17}{\sqrt{n_\theta}}]$ due to Proposition 7.6, (6.43) and (6.40), respectively. By (6.44), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}(J_n - n_\theta)^2 &= \mathbb{E}[J_n^2] - 2n_\theta\mathbb{E}[J_n] + n_\theta^2 \\
&= \mathbb{E}[J_n](\tfrac{2}{3} - 2n_\theta + \alpha_{n_\theta}) - \beta_{n_\theta} + 2n_\theta^2 \\
&= (n_\theta + \tfrac{4}{3})(\tfrac{2}{3} - 2n_\theta + \alpha_{n_\theta}) + \gamma_{n_\theta}(\tfrac{2}{3} - 2n_\theta + \alpha_{n_\theta}) - \beta_{n_\theta} + 2n_\theta^2 \\
&= n_\theta(\alpha_{n_\theta} - 2) + \tfrac{4}{3}(\tfrac{2}{3} + \alpha_{n_\theta}) + \gamma_{n_\theta}(\tfrac{2}{3} - 2n_\theta + \alpha_{n_\theta}) - \beta_{n_\theta}.
\end{aligned} \tag{6.46}$$

In particular, using the above upper bounds for $\alpha_{n_\theta}, \beta_{n_\theta}$ and γ_{n_θ} and the fact that $n_\theta \ge 2$,

$$\left|\mathbb{E}\left(\tfrac{J_n - n_\theta}{\sqrt{n_\theta}}\right)^2 - (\alpha_{n_\theta} - 2)\right| \le \frac{1}{\sqrt{n_\theta}}\left(\frac{56}{3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{n_\theta}} + \frac{17}{n_\theta}\left(\frac{14}{3} + 2n_\theta\right) + \frac{80}{3\sqrt{n_\theta}}\right) \le \frac{C^{(1)}}{\sqrt{n_\theta}} \tag{6.47}$$

for some constant $C^{(1)} > 0$.

Notice that $\tau_{J_n} \ge \theta_n$ $\mathbb{P}$-almost surely by the definition of J_n. Hence, by (6.42), it holds that $\mathbb{E}[\tau_1]\mathbb{E}[J_n] = \mathbb{E}[\tau_{J_n}] \ge \theta_n$, which yields the upper bound

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|(\alpha_{n_\theta} - 2) - \frac{2}{3}\right| = 2\left|\frac{\mathbb{E}[J_n(\tau_{J_n} - \theta_n)]}{\mathbb{E}[\tau_1]\mathbb{E}[J_n]} - \frac{4}{3}\right| \\
&\le \frac{2}{\mathbb{E}[\tau_1]\mathbb{E}[J_n]}\left(\left|n_\theta\mathbb{E}[\tau_{J_n} - \theta_n] + \mathbb{E}[(J_n - n_\theta)(\tau_{J_n} - \theta_n)] - \frac{4}{3}\mathbb{E}[\tau_1]\mathbb{E}[J_n]\right|\right) \\
&\le \frac{2}{\theta_n}\left(\left|n_\theta\mathbb{E}[\tau_{J_n} - \theta_n] - \frac{4}{3}\mathbb{E}[\tau_{J_n}]\right| + \mathbb{E}\left|(J_n - n_\theta)(\tau_{J_n} - \theta_n)\right|\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{6.48}$$

By the relation $\theta_n = \frac{n_\theta T}{n}$ and Lemma 6.6,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|n_\theta \mathbb{E}[\tau_{J_n} - \theta_n] - \frac{4}{3}\mathbb{E}[\tau_{J_n}]\right| = \left|n_\theta \left(\mathbb{E}\left[\tau_{J_n}\right] - \theta_n - \frac{4}{3}\frac{T}{n}\right) + \frac{4}{3}\left(\theta_n - \mathbb{E}[\tau_{J_n}]\right)\right| \\
&\leq n_\theta \left|\mathbb{E}\left[\tau_{J_n}\right] - \theta_n - \frac{4}{3}\frac{T}{n}\right| + \frac{4}{3}\left|\theta_n - \mathbb{E}[\tau_{J_n}]\right| \\
&\leq n_\theta \left(\frac{17}{\sqrt{n_\theta}}\frac{T}{n}\right) + \frac{4}{3}\left(\frac{4}{3}\frac{T}{n} + \frac{17}{\sqrt{n_\theta}}\frac{T}{n}\right) \\
&= \frac{\theta_n}{\sqrt{n_\theta}}\left(17 + \frac{16}{9}\frac{1}{\sqrt{n_\theta}} + \frac{68}{3}\frac{1}{n_\theta}\right) \leq \frac{C^{(2)}\theta_n}{\sqrt{n_\theta}}
\end{aligned} \tag{6.49}$$

for a constant $C^{(2)} > 0$. Moreover, by Hölder's inequality, (6.5) and (6.43),

$$\mathbb{E}\left|(J_n - n_\theta)(\tau_{J_n} - \theta_n)\right| \leq \left(n_\theta \mathbb{E}\left(\tfrac{J_n - n_\theta}{\sqrt{n_\theta}}\right)^2 \mathbb{E}\left(\tau_{J_n} - \theta_n\right)^2\right)^{1/2} \leq \frac{C^{(3)}\sqrt{n_\theta}T}{n} = \frac{C^{(3)}\theta_n}{\sqrt{n_\theta}} \tag{6.50}$$

for some constant $C^{(3)} > 0$. Consequently, by (6.47), (6.48), (6.49) and (6.50) it holds that

$$\left|\mathbb{E}\left(\tfrac{J_n - n_\theta}{\sqrt{n_\theta}}\right)^2 - \frac{2}{3}\right| = \left|\mathbb{E}\left(\tfrac{J_n - n_\theta}{\sqrt{n_\theta}}\right)^2 - (\alpha_{n_\theta} - 2)\right| + \left|(\alpha_{n_\theta} - 2) - \frac{2}{3}\right| \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{n_\theta}}$$

for $C := C^{(1)} + 2C^{(2)} + 2C^{(3)}$. □

Remark 6.10. In the proof of [11, Proposition 11.2], an explicit expression for α_{n_θ} in (6.45) is given based on the relation

$$\mathbb{E}[J_n \tau_{J_n}] = \mathbb{E}[J_n]\mathbb{E}[\tau_{J_n}]. \tag{6.51}$$

However, we were not able to verify (6.51). One can see that J_n and τ_{J_n} are not independent since, for example, $\mathbb{P}(J_n = 2, \tau_{J_n} > 3h) = 0$ while both $\{J_n = 2\}$ and $\{\tau_{J_n} > 3h\}$ have positive probability.

7 Appendix: Results related to random times L and J

Recall that if $(h, \theta) \in (0, \infty) \times (0, T]$ is fixed and $(\tau_k)_{k=0,1,\ldots}$ is the sequence of passage times of $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ defined in (2.4), we let $L = \sup\{k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\} : \tau_k < \theta\}$. In this section our aim is to give a representation for the function

$$y \mapsto \mathbb{P}(L \text{ even} | X_\theta = y), \tag{7.1}$$

where $\{L \text{ even}\} := \{L \in 2\mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}\} = \left\{X_{\tau_L} \in \mathbb{Z}_e^h\right\}$. Let us also recall that $\mathbb{Z}^h = \mathbb{Z}_o^h \cup \mathbb{Z}_e^h$, where $\mathbb{Z}_o^h = \{(2k+1)h : k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ and $\mathbb{Z}_e^h = \{2kh : k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$.

Definition 7.1. [Brownian bridge] Let $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ and $l > 0$. A Gaussian process $(b_t^{x \to y, l})_{t \in [0,l]}$ with mean and covariance functions given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[b_t^{x \to y, l}] &= x + \tfrac{t}{l}(y - x), \quad 0 \leq t \leq l \\
\text{Cov}(b_s^{x \to y, l}, b_t^{x \to y, l}) &= s\left(1 - \tfrac{t}{l}\right), \quad 0 \leq s \leq t \leq l,
\end{aligned} \tag{7.2}$$

is called the (generalized) Brownian bridge from x to y of length l.

Remark 7.2. By comparing the mean and covariance functions, one verifies that a Brownian bridge $(b_t^{x\to y,l})_{t\in[0,l]}$ is equal in law with the transformed processes below:

$$(b_{l-t}^{y\to x,l})_{t\in[0,l]} \qquad \text{("time reversal")} \tag{7.3}$$

$$(x + b_t^{0\to y-x,l})_{t\in[0,l]} \qquad \text{("shifting in space")} \tag{7.4}$$

$$(b^{-x\to -y,l})_{t\in[0,l]} \qquad \text{("reflection around the } x\text{-axis")}. \tag{7.5}$$

A continuous version of a Brownian bridge $(b_t^{x\to y,\theta})_{t\in[0,\theta]}$ can be thought as a random function on the canonical space $(C[0,l], \mathcal{B}(C[0,\theta]), \mathbb{P}_{x,\theta,y})$, where $\mathbb{P}_{x,\theta,y}$ denotes the associated probability measure. In the following proposition we give different characterizations for the function (7.1) in terms of hitting times. For all $c \in \mathbb{R}$, $a < b$ and $\omega \in C[0,\theta]$, we let

$$H_c(\omega) := \inf\{t \in [0,\theta] : \omega_t = c\}, \qquad H_{(a,b)}(\omega) := \inf\{t \in [0,\theta] : \omega_t \notin (a,b)\},$$
$$\hat{H}_c(\omega) := \sup\{t \in [0,\theta) : \omega_t = c\}, \qquad \hat{H}_{(a,b)}(\omega) := \sup\{t \in [0,\theta) : \omega_t \notin (a,b)\}.$$

Proposition 7.3. *Let $(h,\theta) \in (0,\infty)\times(0,T]$. Suppose that $(b_t)_{t\in[0,\theta]}^{y/\sigma\to 0,\theta}$ is a Brownian bridge on a probability space $(\tilde{\Omega},\tilde{\mathcal{F}},\tilde{\mathbb{P}})$, and define*

$$q(y) := q(y,h,\theta) := \tilde{\mathbb{P}}((b_t^{y/\sigma\to 0,\theta})_{t\in[0,\theta]} \text{ hits } \mathbb{Z}_e^{h/\sigma} \text{ before hitting } \mathbb{Z}_o^{h/\sigma}), \quad y \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{7.6}$$

Then, for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$(i) \quad q(y) = \mathbb{P}(L \text{ even} | X_\theta = y), \quad y \notin \mathbb{Z}^h, \tag{7.7}$$

$$(ii) \quad q(y) = \begin{cases} \mathbb{P}_{y/\sigma,\theta,0}(H_{2kh/\sigma} < H_{(2k+1)h/\sigma}), & y \in (2kh,(2k+1)h) \\ \mathbb{P}_{y/\sigma,\theta,0}(H_{2kh/\sigma} < H_{(2k-1)h/\sigma}), & y \in ((2k-1)h,2kh) \end{cases} \tag{7.8}$$

$$(iii) \quad q(y) = \begin{cases} \frac{d_o(y)}{h} + \frac{y}{h\theta}\mathbb{E}_{0,\theta,y/\sigma}\left[H_{((y-(2k+1)h)/\sigma,(y-2kh)/\sigma)}\right], & y \in (2kh,(2k+1)h) \\ \frac{d_o(y)}{h} - \frac{y}{h\theta}\mathbb{E}_{0,\theta,y/\sigma}\left[H_{(-(2kh-y)/\sigma,(y-(2k-1)h)/\sigma)}\right], & y \in ((2k-1)h,2kh) \end{cases}. \tag{7.9}$$

Here $\mathbb{P}$ refers to the probability measure on the space $(\Omega,\mathcal{F},\mathbb{P})$ considered in Section 2.

Remark 7.4. It is clear by (7.5) that the function q is symmetric.

Proof of 7.3. Item (ii) is clear. To show (i), observe that if $X_\theta(\omega) \in (2kh,(2k+1)h)$ and $L(\omega)$ is even, the path $t \mapsto X_t(\omega)$ does hit $2kh$ at $\tau_L(\omega)$ and afterwards, i.e. on $[\tau_L(\omega),\theta)$, it does not hit any other mh ($m \neq 2k$) and hence stays inside $((2k-1)h,(2k+1)h)$. Therefore, the last entry of this path into $(2kh,(2k+1)h)$ occurs via $2kh$, and thus

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(L \text{ even}, X_\theta \in (2kh,(2k+1)h)) &= \mathbb{P}^0(\sigma\omega_{\hat{H}_{(2kh,(2k+1)h)(\omega)}} = 2kh,\ \sigma\omega_\theta \in (2kh,(2k+1)h)) \\ &= \mathbb{P}^0\big(\omega_{\hat{H}_{(2kh/\sigma,(2k+1)h/\sigma)(\omega)}} = \tfrac{2kh}{\sigma},\ \omega_\theta \in (\tfrac{2kh}{\sigma},\tfrac{(2k+1)h}{\sigma})\big) \\ &= \mathbb{P}^0(\hat{H}_{2kh/\sigma} > \hat{H}_{(2k+1)h/\sigma}),\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbb{P}^0$ denotes the Wiener measure on $(C[0,\theta],\mathcal{B}(C[0,\theta]))$. Thus, for $y \in (2kh,(2k+1)h)$,

$$\mathbb{P}(L \text{ even} | X_\theta = y) = \mathbb{P}_{0,\theta,y/\sigma}(\hat{H}_{2kh/\sigma} > \hat{H}_{(2k+1)h/\sigma}) = \mathbb{P}_{y/\sigma,\theta,0}(H_{2kh/\sigma} < H_{(2k+1)h/\sigma}) = q(y)$$

by [8, Chapter 1, Exercise 3.16], (7.3) and (7.8), respectively. The case $y \in ((2k-1)h, 2kh)$ is similar.

For (iii), assume $y \in ((2k-1)h, 2kh)$; the case $y \in (2kh, (2k+1)h)$ is similar. It is clear that whenever $z \notin (a,b)$, $a < 0 < b$ and $\tilde{H}_{(a,b)} = \inf\{t \in [0,\theta] : b_t^{0\to z,\theta} \notin (a,b)\}$,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}\left[b^{0\to z,\theta}_{\tilde{H}_{(a,b)}}\right] = a\mathbb{P}_{0,\theta,z}(H_a < H_b) + b\big(1 - \mathbb{P}_{0,\theta,z}(H_a < H_b)\big),$$

or equivalently,

$$\mathbb{P}_{0,\theta,z}(H_a < H_b) = \frac{b}{b-a} - \frac{1}{b-a}\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}\left[b^{0\to z,\theta}_{\tilde{H}_{(a,b)}}\right] = \frac{b}{b-a} - \frac{z}{\theta(b-a)}\mathbb{E}_{0,\theta,z}\left[H_{(a,b)}\right]. \tag{7.10}$$

For the latter equality, see [3, Remark 4.3]. In addition, from (7.8) we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} q(y) &= \mathbb{P}_{y/\sigma,\theta,0}(H_{2kh/\sigma} < H_{(2k-1)h/\sigma}) \\ &= \mathbb{P}_{0,\theta,-y/\sigma}(H_{(2kh-y)/\sigma} < H_{((2k-1)h-y)/\sigma}) \\ &= \mathbb{P}_{0,\theta,y/\sigma}(H_{(y-2kh)/\sigma} < H_{(y-(2k-1)h)/\sigma}) \end{aligned} \tag{7.11}$$

by (7.4) and (7.5). Substitute $z = \frac{y}{\sigma}$, $a = \frac{y-2kh}{\sigma}$ and $b = \frac{y-(2k-1)h}{\sigma}$. Then $z \notin (a,b)$, $a < 0 < b$, $b - a = \frac{h}{\sigma}$ and hence by (7.10) and (7.11) we have

$$\begin{aligned} q(y) &= \frac{y-(2k-1)h}{h} - \frac{y}{\theta h}\mathbb{E}_{0,\theta,y/\sigma}\left[H_{(a,b)}\right] \\ &= \frac{d_o(y)}{h} - \frac{y}{\theta h}\mathbb{E}_{0,\theta,y/\sigma}\left[H_{(-(2kh-y)/\sigma,(y-(2k-1)h)/\sigma)}\right]. \end{aligned}$$

□

Observe that $\frac{d_o(y)}{h}$ is the probability of the event that the Brownian motion $(W_t + \frac{y}{\sigma})_{t\geq 0}$ (in contrast to the bridge $(b_t^{y/\sigma\to 0,\theta})_{t\in[0,\theta]}$) hits $\mathbb{Z}_e^{h/\sigma}$ before hitting $\mathbb{Z}_o^{h/\sigma}$. In order to replace the function q with the function $\frac{d_o(\,\cdot\,)}{h}$ in computations, we give an estimate for their difference in the proposition below.

Proposition 7.5. *Suppose that $(h,\theta) \in (0,\infty)\times(0,T]$, and define a function*

$$\varrho : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}, \quad \varrho(y) := \varrho(y,h,\theta) := q(y) - \frac{d_o(y)}{h}, \quad y \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{7.12}$$

where $q = q(\,\cdot\,,h,\theta)$ is the function introduced in (7.6) and $d_o(y) = dist(y,\mathbb{Z}_o^h)$. Then

$$|\varrho(y)| \leq \max\left\{1, \frac{2\,|y|}{\sqrt{\sigma^2\theta}}\right\}\frac{h}{\sqrt{\sigma^2\theta}}, \quad y \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{7.13}$$

Proof. As shown in [3, Lemma 2.1 and Theorem 4.1], for $a < 0 < b$ and $z \notin (a,b)$ it holds that

$$\mathbb{E}_{0,\theta,z}[H_{(a,b)}] = \begin{cases} 4(|a| + z/2)b, & z \geq b \\ 4\,|a|\,(b + |z|\,/2), & z \leq a \\ \max\{1, \sqrt{\theta}/\,|z|\}b^2, & a = -b \end{cases}. \tag{7.14}$$

One can easily check that by the definition of ϱ, it holds that $|\varrho| = 0$ on $\mathbb{Z}^h$, so w.l.o.g. we suppose that $y \in \mathbb{R}\backslash\mathbb{Z}^h$. We prove (7.13) for $y \in (-h, h)$ and $y \notin (-h, h)$ separately.

Case $y \in (-h, h)$**:** Since q and d_o are symmetric, ϱ also is symmetric, so that it suffices to consider the case where $y \in (0, h)$, i.e. $y \in (2kh, (2k+1)h)$ for $k = 0$. By (7.9) and (7.14), we thus have

$$\begin{aligned} |\varrho(y)| &= \frac{y}{\theta h}\mathbb{E}_{0,\theta,y/\sigma}\left[H_{((y-h)/\sigma,y/\sigma)}\right] \leq \frac{4y}{\theta h}\left(\frac{|y-h|}{\sigma} + \frac{y}{2\sigma}\right)\frac{y}{\sigma} \\ &\leq \frac{2y}{\theta h}\left(\frac{2(h-y)}{\sigma} + \frac{y}{\sigma}\right)\frac{y}{\sigma} \leq \frac{2|y|h}{\sigma^2\theta}. \end{aligned} \tag{7.15}$$

Case $y \notin (-h, h)$**:** For $y \notin (-h, h)$, observe that $\mathbb{P}_{0,\theta,y/\sigma}(H_{(a/\sigma,b/\sigma)} \leq H_{(-h/\sigma,h/\sigma)}) = 1$ whenever $0 \in (a, b) \subset (-h, h)$ by the continuity of the sample paths. Hence, by (7.14),

$$|\varrho(y)| \leq \frac{|y|}{\theta h}\mathbb{E}_{0,\theta,y/\sigma}\left[H_{(-h/\sigma,h/\sigma)}\right] \leq \frac{|y|}{\theta h}\max\left\{1, \frac{\sqrt{\sigma^2\theta}}{|y|}\right\}\frac{h^2}{\sigma^2} = \max\left\{\frac{|y|h}{\sigma^2\theta}, \frac{h}{\sqrt{\sigma^2\theta}}\right\}. \tag{7.16}$$

Inequality (7.13) then follows by (7.15) and (7.16). □

For the following proposition, recall the definition of the linearization operators Π_e and Π_o (Definition 4.1) and recall that $J = \inf\{2m \in 2\mathbb{N} : \tau_{2m} > \theta\}$.

Proposition 7.6. *Suppose that* $(h, \theta) \in (0, \infty) \times (0, T]$ *and* $f \in \mathcal{B}_{exp}$*. Then*

(i) $\mathbb{E}\big[f(X_{\tau_J})\big|\mathcal{F}_\theta\big] = \Pi_e f(X_\theta)$ $\mathbb{P}$*-a.s. on* $\{L$ *odd*$\}$,
(ii) $\mathbb{E}\big[f(X_{\tau_J})\big|\mathcal{F}_\theta\big] = \Pi_o\Pi_e f(X_\theta)$ $\mathbb{P}$*-a.s. on* $\{L$ *even*$\}$,
(iii) $\mathbb{E}\left[\tau_J - \theta|\mathcal{F}_\theta\right] = \sigma^{-2}(h^2 - d_o^2(X_\theta))$ $\mathbb{P}$*-a.s. on* $\{L$ *odd*$\}$,
(iv) $\mathbb{E}\left[\tau_J - \theta|\mathcal{F}_\theta\right] = \sigma^{-2}(2h^2 - d_e^2(X_\theta))$ $\mathbb{P}$*-a.s. on* $\{L$ *even*$\}$,
(v) $\dfrac{\mathbb{E}[J(\tau_J - \theta)]}{\mathbb{E}[\tau_1]\mathbb{E}[J]} \in [0, 2]$,
(vi) $\mathbb{E}[\tau_J - \theta|X_\theta = x] = \sigma^{-2}(h^2 - d_o^2(x))\big(1 - q(x)\big) + \sigma^{-2}(2h^2 - d_e^2(x))q(x)$ *Leb-a.e. on* $\mathbb{R}$.

Remark 7.7. The assumption $f \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{exp}}$ and the observation $|X_J - X_\theta| \leq 2h$ ($\mathbb{P}$-a.s.) guarantee that the expectations in (i) and (ii) are finite.

Proof. The items (i)–(v) are proved in [11, pages 348 and 356]. For the convenience of the reader, we give the general idea for the proof of these statements. For notational simplicity, in the following we will write a.s. instead of $\mathbb{P}$-a.s.

(i): For all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, let $A_{2k+1} := \{X_{\tau_L} = (2k+1)h\} \in \mathcal{F}_\theta$. Then, a.s. on A_{2k+1},

$$\tau_J = \inf\{t \geq 0 : X_{t+\theta} - X_\theta \notin (2kh - X_\theta, (2k+2)h - X_\theta)\} + \theta,$$

and since $X_{\tau_J} \in \mathbb{Z}_e^h$ a.s., the strong Markov property of $(X_t)_{t\geq 0}$ implies that a.s. on A_{2k+1},

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[f(X_{\tau_J})\middle|\mathcal{F}_\theta\right] &= f(2kh)\mathbb{P}(X_{\tau_J}=2kh|\mathcal{F}_\theta) + f((2k{+}2)h)\mathbb{P}(X_{\tau_J}=(2k{+}2)h|\mathcal{F}_\theta)\\ &= f(2kh)\frac{(2k{+}2)h - X_\theta}{2h} + f((2k{+}2)h)\frac{X_\theta - 2kh}{2h} = \Pi_e f(X_\theta).\end{aligned}$$

(ii): Again for all $k\in\mathbb{Z}$, let $B_{2k}=\{X_{\tau_L}=2kh\}$ and notice that a.s. on B_{2k},

$$\begin{aligned}\tau_{J-1} &= \inf\left\{t\geq\theta : X_t\notin((2k{-}1)h,(2k{+}1)h)\right\}\\ \tau_J &= \inf\left\{t\geq\tau_{J-1} : \left|X_t - X_{\tau_{J-1}}\right| = h\right\},\end{aligned}$$

and hence a.s. on B_{2k}, by the strong Markov property,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[f(X_{\tau_J})|\mathcal{F}_\theta\right] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}\left[f(X_{\tau_J}{-}X_{\tau_{J-1}}{+}X_{\tau_{J-1}})|\mathcal{F}_{\tau_{J-1}+}\right]|\mathcal{F}_\theta\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\Pi_e f(X_{\tau_{J-1}})|\mathcal{F}_\theta\right]\\ &= \Pi_o\Pi_e f(X_\theta)\end{aligned}$$

in the same way as in (i).

(iii)–(iv) : The strong Markov property of $(X_t)_{t\geq 0}$ implies that a.s. on A_{2k+1},

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[\tau_J-\theta|\mathcal{F}_\theta\right] &= \sigma^{-2}\left|2kh - X_\theta\right|\left((2k{+}2)h - X_\theta\right)\\ &= \sigma^{-2}d_e(X_\theta)(h+d_o(X_\theta))\\ &= \sigma^{-2}(h^2 - d_o^2(X_\theta)),\end{aligned}$$

and a similar observation applies to (iv) by first writing $\tau_J = \tau_J - \tau_{J-1} + \tau_{J-1}$ on B_{2k}.

(v) : Since J is $\mathcal{F}_\theta$-measurable, $\mathbb{E}[J(\tau_J-\theta)] = \mathbb{E}[J\mathbb{E}[\tau_J-\theta|\mathcal{F}_\theta]]$. By (iii) and (iv),

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[\tau_J-\theta|\mathcal{F}_\theta\right]1_{\{L\text{ odd}\}} &= \sigma^{-2}(h^2-d_o^2(X_\theta))1_{\{L\text{ odd}\}} \quad \text{a.s.},\\ \mathbb{E}\left[\tau_J-\theta|\mathcal{F}_\theta\right]1_{\{L\text{ even}\}} &= \sigma^{-2}(h^2-d_o^2(X_\theta))1_{\{L\text{ even}\}} + 2hd_o(X_\theta)1_{\{L\text{ even}\}} \quad \text{a.s.},\end{aligned}$$

where we used the equality $d_e^2(x) = (h-d_o(x))^2, x\in\mathbb{R}$. Hence, a.s.,

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma^2\mathbb{E}\left[J(\tau_J-\theta)\right] &= \mathbb{E}\left[J(h^2-d_o^2(X_\theta))\right] + 2h\mathbb{E}[Jd_o(X_\theta)1_{\{L\text{ even}\}}]\\ &\leq h\mathbb{E}\left[J(h-d_o^2(X_\theta)/h + 2d_o(X_\theta))\right].\end{aligned}$$

Since $d_o\in[0,h]$, $\mathbb{E}[\tau_1] = (h/\sigma)^2$ and $J\geq 0$, the lower bound is obvious. For the upper bound, it suffices to furthermore observe that $h - x^2/h + 2x \leq 2h$ for $x\in[0,h]$.

(vi) : By the tower property of the conditional expectation and items (iii) and (iv), a.s.,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[\tau_J-\theta|X_\theta] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}[\tau_J-\theta|\mathcal{F}_\theta]1_{\{L\text{ odd}\}} + \mathbb{E}[\tau_J-\theta|\mathcal{F}_\theta]1_{\{L\text{ even}\}}\middle|X_\theta\right]\\ &= \sigma^{-2}(h^2{-}d_o^2(X_\theta))\mathbb{P}(L\text{ odd}|X_\theta) + \sigma^{-2}(2h^2{-}d_e^2(X_\theta))\mathbb{P}(L\text{ even}|X_\theta).\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, $q(x) = \mathbb{P}(L\text{ odd}|X_\theta = x) = 1-\mathbb{P}(L\text{ even}|X_\theta=x)$ on $\mathbb{R}\backslash\mathbb{Z}^h$ by Proposition 7.3, and the claim follows. □

References

[1] A. N. BORODIN AND P. SALMINEN, Handbook of Brownian Motion - Facts and Formulae, 2nd edition, Springer (2002).

[2] P. BRIAND, B. DELYON AND J. MEMIN, Donsker-Type Theorem for BSDEs, Electron. Commun. Probab. 6, 1–14 (2001).

[3] C. GEISS, A. LUOTO AND P. SALMINEN, Mean First Exit Time of a Brownian Bridge: Scaling Properties, *work in progress*.

[4] Y. KIFER, Error Estimates for Binomial Approximations of Game Options, Ann. Appl. Probab. 16, 984–1033 (2006).

[5] V. KRISHNAMURTHY, Partially Observed Markov Decision Processes, Cambridge University Press (2016).

[6] D. LAMBERTON AND L.C.G. ROGERS, Optimal stopping and embedding, J. Appl. Probab. 37, 1143–1148 (2000).

[7] Y. MUROI, S. SUDA, Discrete Malliavin calculus and computations of greeks in the binomial tree. European Journal of Operational Research, Vol. 231, 349–361, Elsevier (2013).

[8] D. REVUZ, M. YOR, Continuous Martingales and Brownian Motion, 3nd Edition, Springer (1999).

[9] L.C.G. ROGERS AND E.J. STAPLETON, Fast Accurate Binomial Pricing, Finance Stochast. (1997).

[10] W. RUDIN, Real and Complex Analysis, McGraw-Hill (1966).

[11] J. B. WALSH, The rate of convergence of the binomial tree scheme, Finance Stochast. 7, 337–361 (2003).